THE CATHOLIKE MODERATOR: OR A MODERATE EXAMINATION OF THE DOCTRINE of the PROTESTANTS.

Prouing againſt the too rigid CATHOLIKES of theſe times, and againſt the Arguments eſpecially, of that Booke called, *The Anſwer to the Catholike Apologie*, That we, who are members of the CATHOLIKE, APOSTOLIKE, and *Roman* CHVRCH, ought not to condemne the PROTESTANTS for HERETIKES, vntill further proofe be made.

First written in Freneh by a Catholike Gentleman and now faithfully tranſlated.

See the occaſion of the name of HVGVENOTS, *after the Tranſlaters Epiſtle.*

The third Impreſſion.

LONDON,
Printed for NATHANIEL BYTTER.
1623.

THE CATHOLIKE MODERATOR: OR A MODERATE EXAMINATION OF THE DOCTRINE of the PROTESTANTS.

Proving against the too rigid CATHOLIKES of these times, and against the Arguments especially, of that Booke called, The Apology for the Catholike Apologie, That we, who are members of the CATHOLIKE, APOSTOLIKE, and Roman CHURCH, ought not to condemne the PROTESTANTS for HERETIKES, until further proofe be made.

First written in French by a Catholike Gentleman and now faithfully translated.

See the occasion of the name of HVGENOTS, after the Translators Epistle.

The third Impression.

LONDON,
Printed for NATHANIEL BVTTER.
1637.

THE TRANSLATER TO the Christian Readers.

AND TO ALL THOSE ESPECIALly, whose hard hap it is, or may be, to be seduced vnto Popery: that by the helpe of this Booke, and their owne Prayers, they may be deliuered from the Euill, when the Priests and Iesuits would Lead them into temptation.

THere is a bold Nation of men (the Tempters aboue mentioned I meane) slily of late creps in amongst you (well-meaning and abused people) whose enticements (as you know too well) still begin with the Church; saying you *Protestants* are direct Heretickes, you haue no Church: Are you therefore reconciled to the Church? Meaning all this time the *Romane* Church. Had they surely meant the Catholike Church, I know no *Calvinist* that hath put this Article out of his Creed, *I beleeue the holy Catholike Church*. And to say, *I beleeue*: What else implies it, but to beleeue himselfe to be of it; else, why his *Creed?* That therefore you may make one *Romanist* to answer all thereof; doe but turne him, that would seduce you, vnto these two first Chapters; and he shall there finde, that for those few points of Reformation, both in matter of Doctrine and Ceremonie, wherein the *Protestants* haue iustly dissented from the *Papists*, we can be no Heretiques. And that their owne new Doctors, who boast so much of Antiquitie, can no where shew our Doctrine to be sufficiently condemned, before the time of that fifth Gospell of the *Ro-*

against the Councell of *Trent*, I meane, which ended no more than some sixty yeeres agoe; the third Chapter will euidently shew them. And how incompetent a Iudge an Aduersarie is, and how vnlawfull a Councell that of *Trent* was, the Instances of the fourth and fifth Chapters will evince it. Lastly, that we Protestants, having euer continued true members of the true, holy, and Catholique Church, doe not now need any Reconciliation to theirs of *Rome*, the last Chapter will abundantly demonstrate it. Which six Chapters being written by a Gentleman, who euery where professes himselfe one of theirs, if they would offer to shift off (as they haue euasions enow) by saying that what is written in this Booke, is but the opinion of one Doctor: Loe then, we haue not only the Authors opinions, but the strength of his reasons to vrge them withall. All which are so mannerly, so directly, and so succinctly touched vpon, and come off so handsomely, as no man (in my opinion) hath yet said better, that purposed to say so little.

To giue you therefore the minde of the Author in a word: Nothing was here written with any intention to vrge vs Protestants, any whit to depart from our Right in yeelding to a Reconciliation with them; but to perswade them rather, to esteeme better of vs: and to demonstrate withall, that if they will iudge right, they must needs thinke well. And this is the purpose of the Translater also. To shew you therefore to vnderstand all this Booke: If the Reader shall sometimes feele, that this Author now and then giues the Protestants a light fillip by the way; he shall obserue in the conclusion, that it was to reach his owne Romanists, a smarter blow; which is satisfaction enough. And that he giues vs any at all, let vs but consider, that the Author though hee were a moderate man, yet that he was withall a Papist, and it will take away much of the scandall. Lastly,

which

which will giue vs as much aduantage as we can desire from one man, which is to answer them by one of their owne; this Gentleman the Author *H. C.* was too well knowne here in *England* to haue continued a most zealous Roman Catholique vntill his dying day, and yet neuertheleſſe are all his Reaſons for moderation, directed to the Papiſts, as if they ſhould firſt begin it; and all his concluſions directly for the Proteſtants, as though we ſhould ſtill hold them. Nay and which is ſomewhat more; whereas all this is with vs of *England*, common to our Brethren the Proteſtants of *France*, yet doth this Booke make more for vs at home, than it doth for them, for whoſe ſakes it was firſt written. For though we haue with them entertained the points of Reformation, yet haue we not ſo far receded from the more Primitiue Roman Church (which he ſtands for) but that we ſtill retaine more of the neceſſary Ceremonies, Solemnities, and Church Diſcipline, than they of *France* haue done; witneſſe his ſecond Chapter of Ceremonies; which is ſtill for our aduantage.

As therefore this little Booke hath beene twice already printed in *France*, which is an argument of the Proteſtants good liking of it there, ſo hath it foure or fiue ſeuerall times, both by Diuines and Gentlemen of our owne Religion, been tranſlated both into Latine and Engliſh, which is a demonſtratiue Reaſon to me, how much it hath beene lik'd and deſired. To ſaue therefore the labour of writing it out, which I ſtill obſerued, as many deſirous to doe as could get Copies of it, I haue thought fit to let mine be publiſhed: deſiring all thoſe that light vpon it, to be as impartiall and charitable, as the Author himſelfe wiſhes them. Which if they be, I hope well that the ſtricteſt need not bee offended, and the well-minded may reape much benefit by it. Which being my only deſire, I ſhall euer pray for.

W. W.

THE FIRST OCCASION how the name of HVGVENOTS, which our Author euery where vseth, came first to be giuen to the French PROTESTANTS.

THere is euer some Salt as well as Gall in malice, and this temper makes it sometimes bitterly witty; as may appeare by this name of Hugoenots, *by which and no other, doe the French Papists generally vouchsafe to call the Protestants. It was taken vp about the yeere* 1559. *which was some foure or fiue yeeres before* M^r. Calvins *death. Till which time they were called* Tourengeaux, *of the Citie of* Tours, *where the Protestants mostly vsed. But about that time, there hauing beene a foolish opinion, of a Night-Spirits walking vp and downe the streets, which they called* King Hugon: *This fancie made one of the Citie Gates to be called* King Hugons Gate; *and the Protestants being once obserued in the night to goe thereat vnto their Assemblies and holy Exercises, were hereupon called* Huguenots. *He that will see more of this Name, and the occasion of it, may finde a handsome Discourse of it in* Monsieur Pasquiers Recherches, *lib.* 7. *cap.* 52. *whither I refer you.*

TO ALL THE KINGS FAITHFVL SVBIECTS,

and principally to those *Catholikes, that are desirous of the quiet of the Church and State.*

THERE are now thirty yeeres and more (at seuerall times) since we haue had perpetuall wars with the *Huguenots*, as with Rebels and Heretikes: though we haue perceiued of late that our former opinion was wrongfully conceiued against them: and we may be also mistaken in the latter; and that time, which hath made it appeare, that they are not Rebels, may discouer likewise vnto vs, that they are not Heretikes. But howsoeuer; it were much to be wished in the meane time, that we would entertaine a charitable conceit of them, till there be more euidence giuen in against them.

The bitter dissention in Religion, hath beene the spring-head of all our miseries. That was it, which brought them forth at first, and which yet nurseth them: whence it is now come to passe, that those men who are

at this preſent, diſturbed the State, haue at the very ſelfe-ſame time begun to raiſe tumults in the Realme, and to reuiue and exaſperate the differences which we haue in Religion: In ſuch faſhion, as that the practiſes of the principall Leaguers, and the turbulent Sermons of diuers Preachers (for I blame not all) haue beene (as it were) *Hippocrates* twins, who went alwaies together, laught alwaies together; and it may chance, that theſe alſo may weepe together: and we haue ſeene the experience of it, that the tongues of the one haue done more miſchiefe than the ſwords of the other.

See the cauſe then, why in the beginning of theſe late troubles, the Catholike Apologie hath laboured to qualifie this heat, and to confute the ſlanders giuen out againſt the Reformed Religion, and thoſe of it. Which Apologie hath been in part refuted, but ſo coldly, as that no prooſes which the Confuter produceth, could make me ſee any reaſon, why we ſhould ſo peremptorily condemne the *Huguenots* for Heretikes, although differing from vs, about the explication of ſome points of Religion. Vpon which I was induced a yeere ſince & more, to anſwer the Reaſons aforeſaid. But finding the Arguments to be of great weight, I iudged it fitter to write a iuſt Treatiſe thereof by it ſelfe, than to anſwer the obiections hudled vp together by another man: which hath cauſed me alſo both to ſuppreſſe that which I had written already, and to defer that which I purpoſed to write. And longer I ſuppoſe I had deferred it, if theſe late Tragedies acted in the murthers of our two laſt Kings, had not put me in the conceit of it, how that theſe horrid Acts ſpring from the ſelfe-ſame fountaine, and that only vpon this ground too, namely, *That the Errours of*

Henry 3.
& Henry 4.

the Huguenots are so exceedingly enormous; they found their *Maximes*, by which they perswade themselues, That a man may take any course lawfull or vnlawfull, to destroy them and their fauourers.

Another motiue I also had, which induced mee to proceed in my purpose of writing. Which was the consideration of the fortunate proceedings of our late King * Henry (whom his enemies made to be called, Great) all the time that he continued Protestant: Then whose troubles we need seeke no further example, to shew how God both dislikes mans bloudie courses, and disposes also of his owne proceedings, his owne way. For God neuer produces any extraordinarie euent, without some extraordinarie Designe. But how extraordinarily God in the beginning fauoured his Majestie, whiles he continued Protestant, none knowes so well as his enemies, forasmuch as God made vse of their courses, for his aduancement. They conceited it, that by imbroyling *France* in Ciuill warres, to haue ruined him; and these warres haue increased his honour and power. They, impatient of delayes, thought presently by vnlustinable practises, to haue vrged the late King * to haue prosecuted him with more violence, than behad done heretofore; and these plots of theirs, haue beene both the causes of the vtter ruine of his enemies, and of his reconcilement to the King. Briefly, his enemies thrust Armes into his hands for their owne destructions: and those deuices by which they had thought to haue chased him out of *Guyen*, haue brought him into the heart of *France*; and by the selfe-same meanes whereby they thought to take away his life, they haue

* *Henry* 4.

* *Henry* 3.

giuen

giuen him the Kingdome. May wee imagine that God had no designe, in the bringing about of these purposes? Or what else may wee gather out of all this; but that God is angrie, when we will not permit him to dispose of his owne Church, his owne way, but deuise to preuent him by our owne wisdomes? For which respect, I protest before God, that had I beene the forest enemie that the King had had, yet should I thinke that for no other reason God had so many waies fauoured him, than to punish vs, who by vniustifiable practises out of an impatient zeale, would haue rooted out the Reformed Religion, though erroneous.

Haply then it may fall out, that if wee alter our courses, God will also change his. And as those designes of ours, by which wee verily thought to haue advanced our Religion, haue hindred it: So God also may turne the same meanes which we feared would hinder our Religion, to the aduancement of it. In the meane time let vs know thus much; That God neuer blesses those mens courses, which thinke to anticipate him through impatience. Let vs then haue patience a while; and when wee shall perceiue the times of peace to be fittest for our purposes, let vs (a Gods name) offer the same conditions vnto the *Hugonots*, which they propounded vnto vs before; which was, to assemble the best learned men in both Religions, to discusse friendly the points in controuersie; to the end, that the quiet of the Common-wealth may goe along with that of the Church: which if the *Hugonots* shall accept of, (as I make no doubt but they will) I perswade my selfe, that there may be such a

course

course taken in the Conference, that discouery may be made of many things, which haue beene concealed hitherto from both of vs. Not that I imagine any nouelties can be found out in Religion, (God forbid that I should euer thinke so) but that the meaner questions in controuersie being reconciled, the impertinent ones omitted, the greater may be insisted vpon, to be cleared by more euident demonstrations.

Nor can either partie (considering the points be already sufficiently discussed) imagine that such a conference would be vnprofitable; for although there can hardly be found more solid Arguments, than those wherewith we haue serued our selues heretofore; yet is it one thing to proue, and another thing to satisfie: now wee must not so much maintaine a side, to vanquish, as to winne those that are in the wrong. And thus much I dare say, and I will be able to make good against any contradiction, that neither partie haue in any conference as yet taken that course, which they ought and might haue followed, for the satisfaction of the aduerse partie, and the clearing of doubts.

For mine owne part, though I be the meanest of a Million, who haue embroyled themselues in the disputes of the time, yet dare I vndertake to reduce the points in controuersie to so short an issue, and to set downe such a course for the handling thereof, that more of the truth shall be discouered in this one conference, than in all the other disputes, which haue beene since *Martin Luther* first opposed himselfe against the Popes. For both the issue shall bee so

drawne, and the meanes so disposed of, that the persons of neither Religion (keeping themselues to their owne proper *Maximes*) shall be able to reiect them. I should be too impudent to giue it out, if I were not well assured of my ability for the performance. But I am acquainted well enough with the euasions of either side, to know their fallacies, and I haue also the Art to prevent them.

But the time seemes not to be yet so fit, for wee must haue our *spirits* quiet, as well as our *State*, and aboue all free from that same preiudication. For if we *Catholikes* come to a Disputation, being confident before hand, that the *Huguenots* are already condemned for Heretiques: And they on the other side, that they vnderstand the Scriptures better than S. *Austin*, and that all is cleare on their side; to what purpose serues such a Conference? The Priests and Ministers may seeme as confident as they please, for they are our Teachers, but we should not be so resolute, for we are but Learners. The end which they propose, is the Victorie; but the end which we seeke for, is the Truth. Which if wee haue found, why looke we further? But if we beleeue without searching, we may very well be deceiued.

The chiefe reason then, which induced me to reassume my designe of writing in this point of Moderation, was; that our spirits being something pacified, we might be the better prepared to a Conference, and in that Conference make discouery of the Truth, and by discouery of the Truth, establish a Peace in the Church of God. But I suspecting mine owne insufficiency, and fearing withall to bestow

my labour in vaine: and on the other ſide, being wondrouſly deſirous to ſee an vnion in Religion, I choſe rather to hazard that paines which I had already taken, in publiſhing that anſwer which I had made before, than to looſe a new.

The reaſon then why I that am a *Catholike*, doe rather blame the rigour of ours againſt the *Huguenots*, than their againſt vs (both parties being faulty much alike) is; becauſe he that would reforme another, muſt begin at himſelfe.

The importunitie and arrogancie of mine Aduerſarie, vrges me ſometimes to write not ſo like a *Catholike*, which I doe not purpoſely to confute the *Catholike Religion*; but to ſhew only, That the errors of the *Huguenots* are not ſo groſſe, as our ſide perſwades themſelues they are. And knowing alſo that no one thing hath more ſuppreſſed the Truth, than the meane eſteeme that the one partie hath of the others Arguments. Which (God knowes) is meerely out of ignorance; forſomuch as the deeper learned any man is, the more difficultie he finds in confuting his Aduerſarie. For it is moſt certaine, that *Ignorance* engenders *Vehemency*, and *Vehemencie* blinds vs from diſcouering the *Truth*. For their ignorance that are in the rights, makes thoſe likewiſe the more vehement that are in the errour; and the ignorance of thoſe that are in error, blinds them the more.

See then the true intent of this my Diſcourſe: wherein though I may perchance haue vſed ſome reaſons which in too rigorous a Iudgement, may be eſteemed with the moſt, in fauour of theſe new opinions; yet is not my intent, with them to ſeduce

any man, or to turne them from the Faith of their forefathers, but only to purge their spirits from preiudication vntill further proofe be made. And if such proofe be made (without which I conceiue no hope of vnion in the Church) I adiure thee (beloued Reader, of whether Religion soeuer thou beest) to come with a spirit void of this preiudication: Such a spirit I wish to thee, as I protest I my selfe haue; and I pray God to confirme in all of vs. *Amen.*

The Argument of the Booke.

THe Catholike Apologie hath endeauored to acquit the Huguenots of hereſie by two Reaſons. The firſt is, for that the Religion pretended to be Reformed, is not heretical of it ſelfe, for that the ſubſtance of the Catholike Faith is receiued by the Huguenots, and that the Ceremonies which they haue reiected, were vnknown to the ancient Church, of which two points, viz. Doctrine and Ceremonies, all Religion is compoſed. The ſecond is, that their Religion hath not beene as yet condemned by any lawfull Iudgement: becauſe that before the Councell of Trent, it was not condemned in any Generall Councell, and that the Councell of Trent is neither lawfull of it ſelfe, nor as yet approued of in France. Vpon which conſideration, albeit that the Huguenots had wandred from the true faith, yet ought we not to proceed againſt them, as againſt Heretikes, vntill they haue receiued an arreſt of condemnation, from a Generall Councell: no more than we can in iuſtice put a Malefactor to death, although he be notoriouſly culpable, vntill he be caſt by the Iury, and hath had his triall.

The Author now of the Anſwer to the Apologie, in the ſecond part of his booke, from the fifth Chapter to the fifteenth, trauailes hard to refute the foreſaid Reaſons: in the fifth Chapter, he only propounds his Method; in the ſixth, he would ſhew, that the Religion of the Huguenots is quite another from that of the Catholikes; in the ſeuenth, that the Ceremonies of the moderne Church of Rome were obſerued in the Primitiue Church; in the eighth, that the Doctrine pretended to be Reformed, ſtands

condemned by ancient Councels: in the 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. he defends the Councell of Trent; whereof the 11, 12, and 13. are to prone, that the Councell is absolutely lawfull, and the 9, 10, and 14. that it is receiued in France: *after which method I will also diuide my defence into these six Chapters.*

1. *In my first, I will proue against the reasons of his sixt Chapter, that the* Catholikes *and* Huguenots *thus farre agree in Doctrine, that they are both of one and the same Faith and Religion.*

2. *In my second, against his seuenth Chapter, that neither the* Catholikes, *nor the* Huguenots, *doe accord with the Primitiue Church in the matter of Ceremonies: and that for this reason the* Huguenots *are not to be condemned.*

3. *In my third, against his eighth, that before the times of the Councell of Trent, they stood not publikely and lawfully condemned.*

4. *In my fourth, against his 11, 12, and 13. Chapters, that the Councell of Trent is not lawfull.*

5. *In my fifth, against his 9, 10, and 14. Chapters, that it is not receiued in* France.

6. *In my sixth and last I will conclude, that the* Huguenots *may by good right be still reputed for members of the Catholique, Apostolike, and Romane Church.*

CHAP. I.

That the Catholikes and Huguenots thus farre forth agree in Doctrine, that they are both of the same Faith and Religion.

IT is most cleare, that men of the same Church and Religion, may differ neuertheleſſe about some opinions in Diuinitie. *Austen* accords not with *Hierome*, nor *Epiphanius* with *Chryſoſtome*, nor *Cyprian* with *Gyrechius*, nor *Irenæus* with *Victor*, and queſtionleſſe one of them was in the error; yet were they all Doctors, approued by the Church, and Saints euery one of them. Euery error doth not ſeparate a man from the Church, nor ſhould we regard ſo much the number, as the qualitie of them. *Arrius* accorded with the *Catholikes* in all points but one; inſomuch as the change of a word, yea of one bare letter, would haue compounded the Controuerſie; and yet was he the greateſt Heretike, that euer the Church was troubled with. *Origen*, on the other ſide, diſſented in infinite Tenents, from the other old Doctors, and was yet neuertheleſſe eſteemed a member of the Church.

ὁμοούσιον.
ὁμοιούσιον.

To ſee then, whether the *Huguenots* bee of another Religion than wee, neither their errors, nor their numbers is the thing which is ſo much to be regarded, but the nature of them

onely

only is it: That is to say, what Errors are to be reputed for Heresies, and whether theirs be of that nature.

There be two things which (according to the opinion of the *Catholikes*) make Errors to proue Heresies. The one, when the Errour is of it selfe so enormous, that he is at all times an Heretike that holds it. So that euen before the *Nicene Councell* had decided it, *Ebion*, *Paulus Samosatenus*, and *Arrius* stood then as Heretikes, for that they denied the eternall Diuinitie of the Sonne of God.

The second thing which (according to our opinion) makes an Errour to become an Heresie, is; when any man maintaines an opinion in point of Doctrine, contrary to the Decree of a Generall Councell. So then, the Heresie lies not so much in the mischieuousnesse of the opinion, as in the resistance made against the ordinance of the Church. For example: The opinion of *S. Cyprian* touching Rebaptization was no Heresie in him, because there'd was not as then any Decree of Councell made against it: But since that (saw we) this opinion is condemned legally, it were flat Heresie in any one that should hold it. Of this second *Species* of Heresie, I will intreat in my third Chapter. In this, only of the former; which is; Whether the errors of the *Huguenots* be in themselues so enormous, that they destroy the very foundation of Faith, and by consequence keepe them off, from being of the same Religion with vs.

The first Reason.

Let vs see then, how our *Antagonist* takes vpon him to proue the contrary. *In the first place* (saith he) *both parties, as well the Catholikes as their Aduersaries, repute one another for Heretikes.* I answer, that I finde no impossibilitie, why they may not be both deceiued. For two brothers being in choler, may well renounce one another; and yet they leaue not for all that to continue true brothers alwaies. *Cyril* and *Theodoret* accused one another for Heretiques, and yet neither of them was so. So that this reason is only drawne from the passion of men, when Reason hath abandoned them.

But how doth he proue, that the *Catholikes* repute the *Huguenots* for Heretikes. *The Catholike Church* (saith he) *hath by*

the

the Councell of Trent, condemned diuers of the Lutheran opinions. I answer (according to my first distinction) that it is one thing to returne an opinion for an heresie by condemnation, and another thing to repute it so, of its owne nature. Now whether or no the *Huguenots* be heretickes by condemnation, we will argue it hereafter in our third, fourth, and fifth Chapters. But here we dispute only of the nature of their errour; wherein his proofes are nothing to his purpose. *But* (saith he) *at Rome euery Thursday the Pope pronounces them excommunicate, and prohibits all Catholikes to reade their Bookes.* In like manner, the same day also he excommunicats all sinners; of whom hee dares not denie but that many are of the Church; else should he himselfe be condemned for an heretick by the Councell of *Constance*, which gaue sentence against *Iohn Hus*: That the Church consists as well of the bad, as of the good. And whereas the *Huguenots* Bookes be prohibited, so are also the Bookes of *Machiauel*, *Aretine*, and diuers other *Catholikes*.

Let vs next see the opinion which the *Huguenots* haue of the Catholike Doctrine. *Caluine* (saith he) *writes that the principall points of Doctrine in the Church of Rome, are almost vtterly abolished, and the right vse of the Sacraments in many fashions corrupted.* He needs but little explication, the words themselues answer him. *Caluin* saies not, that the Sacraments are vtterly taken away, but the right vse of them, in many wales corrupted: Nor that the principall points of Religion are vtterly destroied, but almost abolished. A man may be almost kild, and yet liue.

Secondly, to proue how their Religion differs from ours, he produces the controuersies of Originall sinne, Free-will, Iustification, Merits, and diuers others which he iudges of most consequence. It is the greatest pittie in the world to heare how the most of the Preachers in both Religions commonly fight with their owne shadowes, not vnderstanding what it is that their aduersarie holds; which comes onely of the subtleties of words inuented by the deuill to disturbe the Peace of the Church. One partie vnderstanding the word

The second Reason.

Iustification in one sense, and another in another; one, Faith one way, and another in another; one, Grace in one fashion, another after another, and so of the rest: that which we say being true in one acception of the word, and that which they say being likewise true, as they take it. So, that if the desire of contending were taken away, we should soone finde, that the most of those disputes wherewith peoples eares are filled, are only the subtilties of the Schoole, vpon the Etymologies and Definitions of words only. Whence it came to passe, that in the conference at *Regenspurg*, the *Catholikes* and the *Protestants* fell to some agreement in the question of Originall sinne, of Predestination, Free-will, and diuers other points, which is also confessed by Bishop *Andrewes* one of the tarrest enemies that the *Huguenots* euer had. Neuertheless the Author of this answer is so ill aduised, as to chuse out these questions principally, to shew the difference betweene them and vs.

Lindanus in præfat. in Lib. de quæstionibus.

For mine owne part, I will not take vpon me to reconcile the said questions, neither know I well (to confesse mine owne ignorance freely) whether it be possible to be done or not: only thus much I assure my selfe, that the difference is not so great as it is iudged to be. Nor will I too exactly search out the point in controuersie, because I well hope some other man may more happily performe it hereafter. Only I will discourse vpon the said questions as they are commonly vnderstood by the best Doctors in each Religion. In which sense I assume (for ought that I haue yet seene) that the errors of the *Huguenots* are not so grosse, as that they impeach their being members of the *Catholike* Church. To cleere which point, I will reduce these questions to these foure heads: 1. The *Scripture*, 2. *Iustification*, 3. *Prayer*, 4. The *Sacraments*.

1. Scripture.

Concerning the Scripture, he chargeth the *Huguenots* only with one error, which is, that they reiect the Bookes of *Tobit*, *Iudith*, the *Machabees*, and the rest which they call *Apocrypha*, notwithstanding that they were approued for Canonicall by the Counsell of *Trent*.

To

To which I answer: That the *Huguenots* doe not altogether reiect them, but esteeme of them as of holy writings, and full of pietie, of greater authority than any other bookes: only they doe not place them in the same ranke with the other bookes, which are found written in the holy tongues. And this it seemes to me, that *Bellarmine* after a sort accords vnto, for that in his diuision of the Bookes of the Old Testament, he makes two Classes. In the first he ranks the bookes receiued by the *Hebrewes*. And those which be called *Apocryphall*, in the second. But what though the opinion of the *Huguenots* be in this point condemned by the Councell of *Trent*; yet is the Councell of *Laodicea* cleere on their side: And so are also *Hierome*, *Origen*, & *Nicholaus Lyra* himselfe, Cardinall *Caietane*, and many other pillers of the *Roman* Church. So that I would faine know, if that this error of the *Huguenots* be so enormous, as that for this cause they must necessarily be Heretiques; whereof then did it not as well hinder *Hierome* from being a Saint, and Cardinall *Caietane* from being a *Catholike*?

Tom. 1. Contr. 2. l. cap. 4.

Now vnder the title of Iustification, I comprehend all the differences mentioned in the answer, which were examined in the sixth Session of the councell of *Trent*, touching 1. *The Cause*. 2. *The Matter*. 3. *The Instrument*. 4. *and the Effects of our Iustification*. By the Source or principall *Cause*, I meane, That disposition by which our Nature (as we Catholikes vse to say) being both preuented and accompanied by the grace of God, prepares it selfe to Iustification; that is to say, To the operation of the Free-will, which remained in man after his Fall. For the compounding of this difference, means Free-will. Free-will must bee considered in these three estates; Before the Fall of *Adam*, after the Fall, and in the time of his regeneration, after he was againe restored. Wherein there is contained whatsoeuer is necessary for a Christian to beleeue, namely, That man before the Fall of *Adam* had Free-will both to good and euill; And that by his Fall he lost the liberty to doe good: And that by Grace in his Regeneration he againe recouered it. This farre the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots*

2. Iustification.

[illegible] we agreed; The imaginary controuersie then lies onely in the manner how this will is enfranchised or made free. The *Protestant* auerring, That it is the Grace of God, which sets it at liberty by giuing it new powers, whereof it was altogether destitute before. The Catholikes likewise auerring, that the grace of God hath set it at liberty, by loosing the chaines wherewith it was before so captiuated, that it could not set a worke the powers that it had. See here then the true difference betweene them in this point, wherein though the *Huguenots* may bee deceiued, yet is their errour nothing so dangerous, as to ouerthrow the foundation of Faith. In the discussing of which point, we are principally to regard two things; The Iustice of God in punishing *Adams* sinne by this captiuitie; and his Mercy againe in freeing vs. Now if the *Huguenots* be in the wrong, their error is onely in augmenting the Iustice and Mercy of God, by affirming, That the freedome of our wils, is not onely bound, but slaine (as it were.) Death indeed is a more grieuous punishment, than imprisonment; and it is a greater mercy to giue life to the will, than liberty. But while wee the common people breake our braines, about these Metaphors of binding and killing, which they can neuer comprehend; It is sufficient for them to know, that nothing can bee done without Gods good Grace, and to say all with Saint *Austen*, *To doe freely, comes from the Nature of man; to doe well, from Grace; but to doe ill, from our corrupt Nature.* Which saying, as it contraries the whole doctrine of Free-will, so is it confuted vnto, as well by the Catholikes as the Huguenots.

The second thing which behooued to Iustification, is the Matter, that is to say, Whether that righteousnesse, which is infused into vs by Grace, or that of Christ imputed vnto vs by Faith, be it, by vertue whereof we be iustified before God. And this question, though it be all one with that of Iustification, yet our aduersaries, thereby to multiply the number of his Controuersies, makes two of them, so desirous hee is of contention. Concerning which point, the Huguenots are in no error in the ground and substance of the question, so that

though they may be thought to differ neuer so much from vs in the circumstances, yet may they for all that be very good *Catholikes*. For example; A tree which hath the Roote, Stocke & many Armes of it found, may be a good tree though some one bough be crazed: But the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots* are agreed vpon the Roote of the question, that is to say, That there are two things necessary; That we be first quit of our Sinnes, and that we be next indued with righteousnesse; to put off our old garments, and to inuest our selues with new.

1. Vpon the first, the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots* are agreed; namely, That we are pardoned of our sinnes, and redeemed from hell, meerely by the blood of Iesus Christ.

2. Touching the second, both sides hold alike; That to be admitted entrance into heauen, we haue need of Righteousnesse, and that this Righteousnesse comes from Christ.

Now the Righteousnesse which is of Christ, is either Inherent in him, & separated ours, or Inherent in vs, & proceeding from him; being by his grace infused into our hearts; which Act the *Huguenots* call Sanctification: Finally, the *Huguenots* confesse as well as the *Catholikes*, that there be indeed both these kindes of Righteousnesses, onely they differ vpon this, whether the Righteousnesse Inherent in Christ and imputed to vs, or that Inherent in vs, & proceeding from him, be it, by vertue whereof wee become iustified in the sight of God. And what is it to vs, whether another man pays our debts for vs, or giues vs money to pay it our selues? So the (in a manner) they both acknowledge the selfe same Roote, the same Stocke, and the same Armes of this question, onely they cannot agree vpon the smaller Branches which grow out of these Armes. Nay more; they both acknowledge the same Branches too, but they cannot agree, vpon which of them they should rooft. For the *Huguenots* confesse, that whosoeuer are iustified, are also first sanctified, that is to say, That they haue that kinde of Righteousnesse, which the *Catholikes* call Inherent or Secondarie Righteousnesse. But they say, that they dare not build vpon it, but onely vpon that Righteousnesse, which being inherent in

Christ, is by Faith imputed to them. Seing then, that this Righteousnesse of Christ is by generall consent acknowledged to be most perfect; though there may perhaps bee thought to be some errour in the *Huguenots* doctrine, yet no danger can come of it. Like as when a man laies hold on a strong bough, he may very well be deceiued in fearing another may be too weake; yet without doubt he cannot fall, so long as he embraces the which cannot be take.

The Coniunction of Faith and Grace.

Next followes the Instrument by which we imbrace this Righteousnesse, and that is Faith; about the nature whereof the *Huguenots* seeme to him, to hold another error; For that *They deny* (saies he) *that Grace may be had, without the vse of Faith.* Which is but a meere cauill of his, upon the double signification of the word Faith. For if we affirme, That Faith is nothing else, but to beleeue that God is so and so, and that he hath done such and such things, and to be briefe, that all the Christian doctrine is most true; the *Huguenots* will say (with Saint *Iames*) That the deuills do beleeue as much, and that the deuills haue Faith, though without Grace. So that the *Huguenots* mistake, is nothing but in the word, for that they teach, That the Faith of a man, which is deuoid of Grace and Charitie, merits not the honourable title of a Iustifying Faith; and that such a Faith as this, is but the Instrument onely by which we are iustified, which is euer accompanied with Grace, and followed by good Workes. We affirme likewise; That a Faith without Charitie, is a Faith without Forme; wherefore, since the Forme is it, which giues the Being to the thing, it must needs follow, that a perfect Faith can haue no Being, without Charitie, which Tenet is consented vnto, both by the *Huguenots* and the *Catholikes* themselues; only we differ in termes: the *Huguenots* calling Faith without Charitie, an Historicall or dead Faith, and why a Faith without Forme. O my God, what a pitie it is, to beehold the simplicitie of our Christian Faith, thus puzled about these quiddities.

Merit of Workes.

There remaines now the Effects of our Iustification, Good Workes: By which euen we *Catholikes* say, That a man is

not

not made Iuſt, but that being iuſtified before, he increaſes in Righteouſneſſe: That is, of a Iuſt man, he becomes more Iuſt, and being regenerate & in the ſtate of Grace, *He may* (as our Aduerſaries ſaies) *fulfill the Law in ſuch a ſort, that he may by it truly and properly merit eternall life.* But as for the fulfilling of the Law, ſeeing the *Huguenots* doe their beſt to performe it, although they may be thought to erre in confeſſing they cannot doe it; yet hath our Sauiour himſelfe promiſed free pardon for it, in the Parable of the Sonne, who refuſed to doe his fathers will and yet did it.

To returne then to Merits by Workes, the more accurate ſort of *Catholikes* peremptorily deny, that they are at all meritorious, vnleſſe they be died in the bloud of Chriſt. And I aſſure my ſelfe, that not one amongſt ten thouſand *Catholikes*, vnderſtands ſufficiently the meaning of this phraſe; *Workes dyed in the bloud of Chriſt*: but ſimply and without other addition they will ſay, That they are in good hope to merit heauen by their Workes. So that (we ſee) there be three ſeuerall opinions touching this queſtion.

The firſt is of the vulgar *Catholikes*, who are more in number a thouſand times, and who ſimply affirme; That they are inabled to merit eternall life by their good Workes. 1.

The ſecond is of the *Huguenots*, who abſolutely deny, That Good Workes doe merit at all, only (ſay they) God out of his pure Grace, for the Loue of his Sonne, grants them a recompence. 2.

The third is the opinion of the Ieſuites and the learned *Catholikes*, who deny, that any kinde of Workes doe of themſelues merit, but ſuch only (as I ſaid) as are dyed in the bloud of Chriſt. Which opinion accords much better with the *Huguenots* doctrine, then that of the vulgar *Catholikes*: for a thing died is not altered in ſubſtance, as Copper though gilded, yet continues Copper ſtill: the incture and the gilding making the thing onely fairer to the eye. And ſo is it with our Workes, which being by nature corrupt, remaine corrupt ſtill, though died in the bloud of Chriſt, howbeit that the incture and gilding, makes them more 3.

pleaſing

pleasing vnto God, and for the loue which hee beares to Christs bloud, to be rewarded. And if peraduenture they make conscience of vsing the word *Merita*, let vs hearken to *S. Bernard*: *A man cannot* (saith he) *merit eternall life, by any good worke or what soeuer.* And yet I trow, that *S. Bernard* was in this no *Huguenot*. For I well know, that a Iesuite with some neat distinction, can make him speake like a *Catholike*, whatsoeuer his meaning was. Let vs then but doe the *Huguenots* the like courtesie, and make the same distinction in the interpretation of their *Tenent*, as we would doe in the explication of *S. Bernards*, and in this point they will prooue as good *Catholikes* as *S. Bernard*, or our selues.

Ser. 1. de annuntiatione Beatæ Virginis.

4. Prayer.

The fourth point is Prayer: to wit, whether we ought to inuoke the Saints or not. The difference betwixt vs lies in two points: First, whether we ought to direct our prayers vnto them; the second, whether they pray for vs.

For the first this I say, That the *Catholikes* themselues make two extremities: to wit, in the not inuoking them, as the *Huguenots* doe; and in honouring them too much; which is to say, in attributing to them that honour, which is due only vnto God, which the Schoolemen call *Latria*, which whosoeuer does, they themselues hold him for an Idolater. Now the poore people which vnderstand not the Greeke, nor what *Latria* meanes, nor comprehends any other mediocrity, than to adore right downe, or not to adore at all, goes to it *bona fide*, and with as much deuotion, adore our Lady and the other Saints, as they doe God himselfe, in such fashion, as that very hardly (euen in the iudgement of *Catholikes*) can the *Catholikes* themselues herein auoid Idolatry.

As for the other extremity, those *Catholikes* that maintaine Inuocation of Saints, teach only thus much: That it is lawfull to inuoke them, and not vnlawfull, nor to inuoke them. So that there can come no great danger of it, in following the *Catholikes* doctrine if true, nor in following the *Huguenots* though erroneous. The *Huguenots* say furthermore, that we ought to honour them; which we may very well doe without inuoking them. As a Subiect may well honour his Soueraigne

nenigne being absent, though he neuer presented any petition to him in all his life.

As for the second point, to wit, whether they pray for vs or not: I affirme that there be *Huguenots*, that will confesse that they doe; neither doth *Caluin* himselfe deny it: only he saith, that he troubles not himselfe greatly, to know whether they doe or no. But should any of them denie it; where is the danger? *Bellarmine* that great Master of Controuersies affirms, That the soules in Heauen, doe pray for the soules in Purgatory, and they in Purgatory, for those on earth. And yet notwithstanding confesseth, that *Dominicus à Soto* denieth the first, and *S. Thomas Aquinas* the second. Wherefore seeing that Purgatory is more beneficiall to the Pope than Paradise, I can perceiue no reason wherefore the *Huguenots* should rather be Heretiques for disagreeing with the *Catholikes* about the Intercession of the Saints in Heauen, than the *Catholikes* are for differing amongst themselues about the Intercession both of the soules, and for the soules in Purgatory. *Tom. 1. Contr. li. 3. cap. 15.*

The last point wherein the *Huguenots* are departed from the Roman faith is, touching the Sacraments; wherein the number, nature, and particular Sacraments are to be considered of. And they first miscount themselues in the number, reckoning but two, whereas the Counsell of *Trent* hath concluded it, that there are seuen. Which obiection of his is but friuolous; insomuch as the difference lies more in the words, than in the thing. For taking the word *Sacrament* properly, *S. Austin* saith, that there be but two, that is to say, Baptisme, & the Eucharist. Further, it is an ordinarie phrase amongst vs *Catholikes* to say, That all the Sacraments issued out of our Sauiours side: whereas there issued nothing frō thence saue water and bloud, which according as *Chrysostome*, *Cyril*, and other Ancients interpret it, represent the two Sacraments: that is, Baptisme by the water, and the Cup of the Lords Supper, by the bloud. To which our *Catholike* Doctors giue no other answer than this: That the two Sacraments haue some kinde of dignity aboue the rest; which comes to no more than to say, that there be two principall Sacraments, and fiue more, inferiour to those two. Which is all one with the *Huguenots* opi-

5. The Sacraments and their number.

mon, though in diuers manner. They say that there be but two properly; we say that there be but two principally: We againe, that there be fiue more of an inferiour order; they confesse that there may be more, if we meane of Sacraments in the generall signification.

For *Caluin* yeelds, that Order is a Sacrament, but not common to all men, nor will our *Catholike* Doctors say otherwise. Againe, they will confesse with *S. Paul*, that Mariage is also a Sacrament, taking it in that generall signification wherein the Ancients haue translated the Greeke word. Briefely, they will yeeld that there be seuen, but not barely seuen. And in truth there was none of the Ancient Fathers, that euer light vpon this number of seuen. So that though the *Huguenots* cannot so euenly iumpe vpon the number, seeing the Primitiue Church could not doe it; wee may perchance condemne them of ignorance in Arithmeticke, but their errour in Theologie cannot be so great.

The difference betwixt our Sacraments, and those of the old Law.

But he may argue, that they are mistaken in the very nature of the Sacraments; because they deny them to be distinguished in force and vertue, from the Sacraments of the old Law, or that they confer grace. I answer: That this is a meere slander; for the *Huguenots* doe distinguish them from the Sacraments of the old Testament; and doe affirme, that they doe also confer grace. What would you desire more of them? But not (saith he) *ex opere operato*. The difference then is not in the matter, whether our Sacraments confer more grace, or are of more efficacie, than those of the old Law, but in the manner only, by what meanes this grace is conferred. As for the manner, we should not me thinks too narrowly prie into it, as *Bellarmine* very sagely aduiseth vs. *Like as in Christs miracles* (saith he) *the parties that were healed, needed not to inquire in what manner the garment of Christ did cure them, it being sufficient to them to beleeue onely, that the touch of it wrought the cure: iust so it is not necessary* (saith he) *that the Ministers or the Receiuers of the Sacraments should be curious to know, in what manner they become the causes of our Iustification.*

Tom. 2. cont. 1. lib. 2. cap. 1.

The efficacie of Baptisme.

We come next to the particular Sacraments, whereof hee makes mention but of three only: That is to say, Baptisme, the

the Sacrament of the Altar, and Penance. Touching Baptisme, they affirme, saith he; *That Originall sinne sticketh so close to man, that neither by Baptisme, nor any other remedie, can it be gotten off.* I answer: That euen the *Huguenots* confesse as freely as the *Catholikes*, that a man is washed from Originall sinne by Baptisme, which is enough for a Christian to beleeue in this point: so that the difference lies meerely in the nicitie of the word, whether it should rightlieſt be called Sinne, or no Sinne: The *Catholikes* holding, that the Sinne is so farre remitted, that the concupiscence which remaines, ought not to be called Sinne: The *Huguenots* affirming, that the remaining Concupiscence may very well be called Sinne, although they herein consent to the *Catholikes*, That a man is so clearely absolued and discharged of it, that it is not reputed as a Sinne. For which cause in no other sense doe they deny the grace receiued in Baptisme, though they still esteeme themselues sinners altogether, than the Debtor doth his Creditours mercie; who confessing that he hath receiued the fauour of him, to haue his debts forgiuen, doth neuertheleſſe acknowledge himselfe his debtor. Which way soeuer it be taken, the sinner is pardoned, and the debtor discharged, and what need haue we to desire more?

Of Infants dying without Baptisme.

He may say perchance againe: That the *Huguenots* erre not so much in acknowledging the benefits receiued in Baptisme, because they are not so well aware of the danger that followes the want of it: *For they affirme* (saith he) *that the Children of Christians may be sufficiently righteous, and haue admittance into the kingdome of heauen without Baptisme, notwithstanding that Iesus Christ hath said, That whosoeuer is not borne againe of water and of the Holy Ghoſt, he cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen:* I answer: That the *Huguenots* affirme not, that euery childe borne of Christian Parents dying without Baptisme is saued, but those only whom God in his eternall counsell hath elected. So that the question is not so much about Baptisme, as about Gods election: wherein there can be no danger, to confesse our ignorance, referring still Gods owne decrees to his owne good pleasure, as the *Huguenots* doe. For they instance not in what children are elected, but forbeare to presse into Gods cabinet, and out of that to pronounce, that such and such children shall be saued.

And if he replies againe, That the Election of God is neuer destitute of these secondarie meanes, and that Baptisme is the means, by which he saues those that are elected; and that it is a most manifest signe, that those who are depriued of this Baptisme, are also depriued of that election: I answer, That there bee *Catholikes*, who teach, that a man may bee saued without these secondarie meanes. *S. Damascene*, *S. Brigid*, and some other *Catholikes* doe hold, that the Emperour *Traians* soule was deliuered out of Hell by the praiers of *S. Gregory*, notwithstanding that he died a *Painim*, and without Baptisme. If they then be not Heretiques, that teach the mercy of God to be so great, that he saued one who had sinned actually, notwithstanding that he died without Faith, and without Baptisme; why should it be accounted Heresie, to say, that he sometimes saues little Innocents, who neuer had more than Originall Sin? For it is a more extraordinary thing, to draw one out of Hell, than to keepe one from going thither. And what fauour God had shewen to one, he may likewise shew to many.

As for that text of *S. Iohn*, *Regenerate of water and of the Holy Ghost*, it is to shew, that the ordinary meanes vnto saluation, is to conioyne the outward signe to the inward grace, according to *S. Pauls* saying, *That with the heart man beleeues vnto righteousnes, & with the tongue he confesses to saluation*: which shewes thus much; that ordinarily the outward confessiō goes with the inward affection: nor can it be inferred out of the former text, That faith can neuer be without the confession of the mouth, no more than it can by the other, that Grace cannot be without the washing of the body.

The Baptisme of Iohn.

Finding now no great matter in the *Huguenots* Doctrine blameworthy about the Baptisme of Christ, hee descends to the Baptisme of *Iohn*: which in the *Huguenots* opinion differs not at all from that of Christ. To which I answer, That all the *Huguenots* hold not this opinion: Secondly, that this difference is of no such great importance, because that they that hold it, doe it not to derogate from the Baptisme of Christ; for that they esteeme it not *Iohns* Baptisme, but Christs, administred by *Iohn*, before Christs declaring of himselfe, as it was by the Apostles afterwards. Finally, all this dispute is not about Christs Baptisme which the people receiue, but about *Iohns*, which they receiue not; and consequently it matters not much, to vnderstand the force and efficacie of it.

In

In the next place followes the Sacrament of the Altar, which comprehends two differences propounded in the answer. Which be, Christs presence in it; and the Sacrifice of the Masse. Vpon the first the *Huguenots* are accorded with the *Catholikes* in the thing it selfe; that is, That our Sauiour is truly present in the holy Sacrament, and that we doe eat his body, and drinke his blood. The difference only lies in the manner, how he is present, & how we eat and drinke him. Which errour cannot touch the foundation of Faith, for as much as, according to our *Catholike* Doctors opinion, it was left free for euerie man, by the space of 1000 yeeres after Christs death, to beleeue this presence of his, in what manner they thought best, prouided that they beleeue it at all. Whence it is manifest, that it is but the *Huguenots* ill luck to liue in such a rigorous age of the Church, otherwise they should not for this haue beene heretickes. For diuers of the ancient Fathers were infected with this errour. *Theodoret*, yea and *Gelasius* too, who was also Pope, haue written in expresse words, That euen after the Consecration of these holy Mysteries, the very nature and substance of the bread remained still. True it is that the *Huguenots* may well be shent for reuiuing of this errour, when they see that the Church of *Rome*, and which is more, the Pope himselfe hath condemned it; neuertheless seeing that *Gelasius*, who was likewise a Pope, held the verie same error; we *Catholikes* should doe well to qualifie it all we can, for the reputation of the See *Apostolique*. Transubstantiation. *Theod. Dialog.* *Gelasius lib. de duabus naturis.*

Now for the Sacrifice of the Masse, they both confesse with S^t. *Paul*, that there is but one Sacrifice for sinne, namely, that one of Iesus Christ vpon the Crosse; in such sort, that the *Catholikes* affirme nor, that they make any new Oblation, but only represent that former one, so oftentimes ouer, as they celebrate the *Eucharist*, in which Christ is continually offered vp. But for as much as S^t. *Paul* teaches, *That there is not only but one Sacrifice*, but also that Iesus Christ is but once offered: this Doctrine of ours had need be verie subtilly interpreted, which no man in my iudgement could finelier doe than S^t. *Thomas Aquinas*, who saith, *That this Sacrament is named an Immolation of Christ, in two regards, the first, for that* (as S^t. *Austin* saith) *Signes are called by the names of the things whereof they be Signes: the second, for that by vertue* The Sacrifice of the Masse. Heb. 7. 10. *Thomas part. quest. 83. Artic. 1.*

of this Sacrament, we are made partakers of the death of Iesus Christ. Well, let vs see then how farre the *Huguenots* accord with S^t. *Thomas* in these two manners of the offering vp of Christ Iesus. For the first, seeing that it is collected out of S^t. *Austen*, let vs heare him in his owne words. *He falsifies not* (saith he) *who saies that Iesus Christ is offered vp euery day, for if the Sacraments had not a kinde of resemblance of the things whereof they be Sacraments, they could not be Sacraments at all; and by reason of this resemblance, they ordinarily take the names of the things themselues.* According to which interpretation the *Huguenots* will also say, that Christ is offered vp in the Sacrament, for as much as the Sacraments haue the name of the things which they signifie. And seeing that the Eucharist signifies the death of Christ, a man may well giue the same terme to the Eucharist, which he does to his death. And for as much as he was offered vp by his death, the *Huguenots* wil confesse likewise, that he is also offered vp in the Eucharist, by reason (as *S. Austen* saith) of this resemblance betweene them.

Aug. ad Bonifacium, Epist. 23.

Concerning the second respect, for which *S. Thomas* saies, that the Eucharist is called the *Immolation* of Iesus Christ, that is, for that in the Sacrament we are made partakers of the death of Iesus Christ; the *Huguenots* will also agree thereunto. For it is their common phrase of speech to say, that in this Supper they are made partakers of the death and passion of Iesus Christ. Now if there be any third way of offering, questionlesse it is no matter of any great importance; for that *S. Thomas* was so good a Catholike, and so subtill a Logician, and aboue all, so experienced in the distinctions and other stratagems of the Schoole, would neuer haue made mention barely of two manners of offerings, had there beene any third of any consequence.

Penance. The last Sacrament which he instances in, is *Penance*, wherein the Author of the Answer obserues no difference, but only names it in that fashion, that I cannot see what fault he finds in the *Huguenots* Doctrine. But to picke out his meaning, I trow, that the difference lies principally in two points: That is to say, Whether this *Penance* be well called a Sacrament, or not; and secondly, What be the parts of it. For the first point, of the title of Sacrament; It is but a wrangling about the word, as I haue shewed before, when I discourst of the number of the Sacraments. As for the

the parts; Namely, *Contrition*, *Confession*, and *Satisfaction*, if that he blames the *Huguenots* for not holding them properly parts thereof; I answer him, That neither doe all Catholikes hold them so: For *Durandus* makes but two parts, *Confession* and *Absolution*, and *Scotus* saies, that there is but one, which is *Absolution*.

But if the question be whether these three things bee requisite or not, the *Huguenots* will also say that they are; to wit, that it is necessary for a Penitent to haue Contrition and sorrow of heart, to confesse and acknowledge our sins vnto God, nay, and that it is profitable also to confesse them to the Pastors of the Church, but not so absolutely necessarie: because (according to the iudgment of the learned *Catholikes*) this Auricular Confession was neuer instituted by God, nor yet of a long time practised in the Church; as *Beatus Rhenanus*, who was himselfe a *Catholike*, hath very well obserued. *In Annot. ad lib. Tertul. de penitentia.*

Finally, as for Satisfaction, it is to be considered either in this life, or in the life to come in Purgatory. That in this life, the *Huguenots* approue of, and teach it to bee most necessary to Salustion, to giue satisfaction to men whom we haue any way offended, and in regard of our sins against God, to walke in newnesse of life. Moreouer, they confesse that God punisheth men in this life by temporall afflictions, yea euen those whose sins are pardoned.

Purgatorie.

Tis true indeed, that they deny any satisfaction or punishment to be in Purgatory after death for sinne: but herein their error cannot be great; first because *S. Austen* puts it down no otherwise than as a thing probable and not necessary, saying no more, but, *It may be that it is true*. And secondly, because that neither can the *Catholikes* agree vpon it amongst themselues; some of them placing Purgatory here vpon earth, others vnder it; some neither aboue, nor below, but in the Aire. Some affirme, that all the elect shall goe thither, yea the Apostles and Martyrs themselues: others thrust in those only, who haue not in this life giuen full satisfaction for their sins. And for the fire, some would haue it a Materiall fire; some, fire and water; others, neither of both. Lastly, some there be that teach, that the soules are there tormented by Deuils; others, by Angels, others by neither of both. How then I pray is this question likely to be so necessary, about wch there is so much vncertainty, *Lib. 21. de Ciu. Dei, cap. 26.*

that

that we neither know (as I haue shewed) who they bee that goe thither, nor where it is, nor by whom they are to bee tormented, nor what they are to suffer. The difference then betwixt the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots*, is but this; That the *Huguenots* beleeue it not at all, and the *Catholikes* know not what they beleeue.

See here in briefe the *Huguenots* opinions vpon the points before mentioned, by which wee may perceiue their errours not to be in the substance of Faith, and doe not therefore hinder them from being of the Church and *Catholike* Religion. For euery errour in Theologie doth not separate a man from the Church. *S. Cyprian* was an Anabaptist in the point of Rebaptization, and yet was he a Martyr. *S. Hierome* (as I said before) held those bookes of Scripture for Apocryphall, which the Councell of *Trent* hath since concluded to be Canonicall, and yet remaines he still Canonized for a Saint. *Tertullian* one of the ancient Fathers fell to be a Montanist: And *Origen* alone held as many errours, as all the *Huguenots* together; yet was he one of the most famous Doctors of the whole Church. And to come neerer to our times; In how many questions of Diuinitie did *Scotus* and *Thomas Aquinas* differ, the two prime pillars of Schoole-Diuinitie? *Melchior Canus* and *Bellarmine* accuse *Caietane* of diuers errours, who for all that remaines one of the venerable Colledge of Cardinals. The *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* could neuer yet agree about our Ladies conception, yet be both of them held for very good *Catholikes*. So that, as I said, the *Huguenots* may very safely bee accounted good *Catholikes*, so long as they hold the foundation of Diuinity, although they put some few tyles out of order on the roofe of the house, and build with hay and straw: vpon condition still, that (as *S. Paul* saith) it be vpon the same foundation. Otherwise we must conclude, the Martyrs, the Saints, the ancient Fathers, the Doctors of the Church, the prime Schoolemen, the Cardinals, yea and the Catholikes themselues, to be no Catholikes.

CHAP.

Chap. 2.

That the Catholikes as well as the Huguenots doe not agree with the ancient Church in matter of Ceremonies: and that therefore the Huguenots are not to be condemned.

AS in men we conſider their bodies, and their apparell; ſo in the Church likewiſe wee conſider the Doctrine, and the Ceremonies. As for the Doctrine or bodie of Religion, I haue ſhowne in the former Chapter, that the Huguenots haue the braine, the heart, and the liuer, and all other the vitall parts, whole and ſound: that is, that they yet hold all the principall points of faith, and that the maine thing that can ſeeme to be blamed in them, is, that they haue ſome certaine warts or ſpots in their skinne; certaine errours I meane, in the circumſtances and application of that faith. Now for the apparell and ceremonie of Religion, I confeſſe that the Church of the Huguenots is not ſo gorgeouſly or richly ſet out, as the Church of Rome, and is for the ſame cauſe not ſo well entertained, and more deſpiſed in the Courts of great Princes and Monarchs of the world: which I iudge to be the reaſon why the Catholike Apologie endeuoured to excuſe the ſimple and naked Ceremonies of the Reformed Church, without any intent thereby to diſparage the gorgeous and gay attire of the Catholike Church; but to ſhew onely, That we ſhould not ſo meanly eſteeme this outward ſimplicitie, as to condemne it without hearing. Euen as that Officer would be held too rigid and ſeuere, that would hinder a poore man from preſenting his Petition to the Prince, becauſe he is not clad like a Courtier.

The reaſon for which the Apology doth excuſe them, is, for that the ancient Church did ſometimes heretofore content her ſelfe with the like ſimplicitie. Now vpon this occaſion the Author of the anſwer perſwades himſelfe that he hath got-

ten a great aduantage vpon the Catholike Apologie: Becauſe (ſaith he) he can proue, that diuers of theſe ceremonies which the Huguenots doe reiect are very ancient. To which I anſwer, That I willingly accept as much as he grants, that is, that he cannot proue that all the ceremonies of the Church of Rome be moſt ancient, but only (as he ſaith) *diuers* of them. As for thoſe diuers which he inſtanceth in, that you may ſee how impertinent they are, I will make it appeare in theſe two things: Firſt, that he doth not proue against the Huguenots, that the Church of Rome doth agree with the ancient Church in the ſelfe ſame ceremonies. Secondly, that admitting that the ancient Church had them in vſe, yet are not the Huguenots to be condemned for hauing diſuſed them.

That the Church of Rome agrees not with the Primitiue Church in matter of Ceremonies.

For the firſt point: my purpoſe is not to condemne the ceremonies of our Mother the holy Church, but ſince that our ſide are ſo ſtrait laced, as to hinder our reconciliation for a thing ſo indifferent as theſe ceremonies are; I haue taken the boldneſſe to oppoſe them: and to ſhew, That the Huguenots may eaſily anſwer the argument which he alledges: which I write not to iuſtifie them, but with a purpoſe that we ſhould not ſo confidently aſſure our ſelues, that all is ſo cleare on our ſides. Let vs heare then how the Huguenots may anſwer the fifteene Examples which he bringeth.

1 Signe of the Croſſe.

The firſt example is the *ſigne of the Croſſe* concerning which, the Huguenots will confeſſe that it hath beene anciently vſed, but that the vſe of this was brought into the Church, vpon a particular occaſion, and proper only to that age. For the Pagans, amongſt whom the Chriſtians in thoſe daies conuerſed, were wont, when they met with a Chriſtian, to make the ſigne of the croſſe in deriſion of their Chriſtianitie, for that the God whom they worſhipped was hanged vpon a croſſe; ſo that the Chriſtians, to ſhew that they were not aſhamed of ſuch a death, in all their actions would ſtill make the ſigne of the croſſe. But now this occaſion being taken away, the Huguenots may likewiſe ſay, that it is not neceſſary to continue the practice no more than it is to apply a plaiſter to a wound already healed.

As for *praying to the Eaſt*: I never yet knew any Huguenot that

that held it vnlawfull to pray towards the East, nor any Catholike that thought it vnlawfull to pray also toward other quarters of the world. What more then is there to be said betweene them, but only that it is an indifferent custome, which hath not beene alwaies so strictly obserued in all Churches. For *Socrates* saith, that in the Church of *Antioch*, the high Altar was placed cleane contrary, and towards the West. Lib. 5. cap. 21. Praying towards the East.

As for the *inuocation of the Eucharist*, our aduersarie affirmes, that it appeareth by Saint *Basil*, *That this inuocation was then and from the Apostles time practised, when they shewed the Eucharist*. I answer, that these words make nothing against the Huguenots, for a man may very well vse inuocation in the time of the celebration of the Sacrament, and all the while direct his inuocation to God, and not to the Sacrament. True it is, that there was a speciall Prayer appointed for that purpose, which Saint *Basil* thought to haue beene a tradition of the Apostles. But now the Catholikes themselues doe not any longer obserue that forme of prayer: and it cannot be found in any antiquitie, what forme of prayer that was, which Saint *Basil* speakes of. So that if this prayer were an Apostolicall Tradition, our Church hath small care in preseruing it; which made me beleeue that we haue some things put vpon vs vnder the title of Apostolicall Tradition, which are not so. For it is still as easie to inuent some new Tradition, which we haue not yet receiued, as to forget those which we haue already entertained. For God ordinarily where he takes away the memory, supplies that defect with inuention and sufficiencie of iudgement. It being very wisely done, when we haue lost one Tradition, to put another in the place, thereby to keepe the number full still, and entire. 3. Inuocation of the Eucharist.

The fourth example is of *Hallowing the water in Baptisme*. Now the Huguenots will confesse with Saint *Basil*, that the water of Baptisme ought to be blessed: But this they denie, that this hallowing was such heretofore, as that now in vse with vs. For as much as they say, That water and all other creatures are sanctified by God already; and particularly that the water of Baptisme needs no benediction to make it more 4. Blessing of the water in Baptisme.

Homil. 25. in Iohan.

holy, because (as Saint Chrysostome) Christ by his Baptisme hath blessed all waters. But if my Antagonist will proceed further to inferre, that the water an Baptisme ought of necessitie to be hallowed in the same sort that it is now; I say, that Eusebius writes, that Constantine the Great would have men to baptize in Iordan, and yet I never heard that all the water of Iordan was made holy water.

5, 6. Consecration and vse of Oile in Baptisme. Tertull. lib. de corona militis.

They will say as much of the *consecration of the Oyle*. The word *Consecration* at the first, signifying no more than the institution of a signe to an holy vse. And as for the vse of Oyle, like as the ancient Church made vse of it in Baptisme, so did they also of milke and honie; neither of which are any more in vse, no not in the Roman Church. Why then should the Huguenots be blamed more for the want of one ceremonie, than the Catholikes would be for want of another? And this also serues to disproue that other example which followes, to wit, that the Roman Church agreeth with the ancient in all the ceremonies of Baptisme.

7. Lent. Epiphan. hæres. 75.

His next example is of the Fast in *Lent*, which Saint *Hierom* esteemes for an Apostolicall tradition. To which the Huguenots will answer, that *Epiphanius* saith, That it is an Apostolicall Tradition also to fast vpon Wednesdaies and Fridayes, except vpon those betwixt Easter and Whitsontide: in which Hieronym. contra Lucif. time the said S. *Hierome* in the very booke quoted by the Answerer, saith, That it is vnlawfull to fast: and yet do the Catholikes fast notwithstanding vpon Fridaies in that very time. Why then are the Huguenots more to be blamed for diuising the custom of the ancient Church in the obseruation of the fortie daies before Easter, than the Catholikes, for dissenting from the same Church, in the obseruation of the 50 daies after?

8. Sacrifice for the dead.

Concerning the *sacrifice for the dead*, it appeares by that Liturgie of the Greekes, which is read in the fift Tome of Saint *Chrysostomes* workes, that they made mention amongst the dead (for whom they made their oblations) of the Apostles and Martyrs; who according to the iudgement of all parties, doe goe directly into heauen, and haue no need of any such oblation as men offer at this day, for the easing of the soules departed.

the very yeere when each of them was inuented. And what though the name of Monks was vsual in the primitiue Church, yet were they then other manner of Monks, than ours at this day. For first, they earned their liuings by the sweat of their browes. Secondly, diuers of them were married, as *Athanasius* writes. Finally, the Huguenots will say, that there was neuer Monke in the Primitiue Church that killed a King; nor any Catholike in those times, that would haue approued it.

Athanasius ad Draconti.m.

14. Election of Meats.

There remaines the *election of meats*; which the Huguenots approue, so that it be done with discretion, and not meerly for conscience, according to the custome of the ancient Church. For the better clearing of this point, wee may (me thinks) distinguish betweene the difference of meats, and the choice of meats. For the Huguenots will say, that there is no difference of meats in respect of Religion; for that it is lawfull to eat indifferently of all sorts of meats, without making scruple of Conscience; but that men for the taming of their flesh may abstaine from such meats, as they finde to prouoke them to concupiscence: which kinde of abstinence because it is left free to the choise of him that fasteth, may properly be called, *Election of meats*. For the Apostles (saith the Ecclesiasticall Story) haue left it to euery mans liberty, to vse as well in their fasts, as on other dayes, such kinds of meats as they best like of. Whereas the Fasts enioyned by the Church of Rome, may rather (will the Huguenots say) be called, *A prescription of meats*, than a free *Election*: because Election is still voluntary, and their abstinence is constrained.

Tripartite 9. 38.

15. Holy-daies. *Lib. 5. cap. 22.*

Finally, concerning *Holy-daies*, which they call an Apostolicall Tradition, I say, that the Ecclesiasticall Stories shew the cleane contrary: For *Socrates* saith in expresse words, *That the Apostles ordained nothing concerning Holy-daies*. Againe, they which supposed them to haue beene ordained by the Apostles, are enforced at length, to place the obseruation of them in the Classe of things indifferent. For of all the Festiuall daies, there was not one of them which hath beene obserued with more deuotion than Easter day; which notwithstanding the Westerne Church vsed to celebrate vpon Sunday, and the Easterne

Easter tide, vpon other daies: the one confirming their custome by the tradition of *S. Peter* and *Paul*, and the other by the tradition of *Philip* and *Iohn*. Which controuersie, was thus taken vp betwixt *Polycarpus* and *Victor* Bishop of Rome; namely, that the obseruation of it should be left free and indifferent. Now the Huguenots doe not simply condemne the obseruation of Holy-daies, but only the forcing to the obseruation of them. For in England, Germany, Swizerland, and other Countries, where the pretended Reformed Religion is established, they to this day obserue diuers Saints daies, without reprehension of the Huguenots in France. *Sect. 7. pag.*

But put the case, that the vse of all the foresaid Ceremonies were such in the ancient Church, as they now are in the Romane; yet say I, that all these examples make nothing to the purpose; For as much as Ceremonies (as I haue said) are but the apparell, which alters the fashion euery foot, and are fitted to time and place: which our Aduersary himselfe confesseth. For, knowing that the most part of our Ceremonies were vnknowne to the Ancients, he hath no other Answer than this, which will also serue to answer him againe, *viz.* That it matters not much, whether the Ecclesiasticall Ceremonies were in vse in the Primitiue Church, or were newly taken vp in these latter times. Now the Scriptures (will the Huguenots say) denounce the same curse against those which adde, as against those which take away: so that if it be lawfull for the Romane Church to adde any thing to the ancient Ceremonies, it is as lawfull for them also to take away, especially those which haue beene added. That the Huguenots are not to be blamed for leauing off the Ceremonies of the ancient Church.

Secondly, the Church is called Primitiue, either in regard of it selfe, because it is truly ancient; or in respect of the moderne Church of Rome, as it is more ancient in its selfe. If we speake now of the Church, as it is ancient in it selfe; the Huguenots will say, that there is no resemblance betwixt the Ceremonies of the ancient Church, and those of the moderne. But if wee speake of that wich is more ancient than ours, (from which only our Aduersaries Arguments are drawne) they will say, that (besides all this, that the most part of our Cere-

Ceremonies are different) yet at that time alſo were there too too many in the Church; in ſo much as Saint *Auguſtine* in his time complained exceedingly of the multitude of them.

Epiſt. 119. 19.

Finally, as the ancient Church had ſome Ceremonies, which the Huguenots haue not; ſo had it likewiſe others, which the Church of Rome hath not; as Milke and Honey in Baptiſme, and the faſhion of plunging the Infant thrice to the bottome: which haue beene abrogated (as Saint *Thomas* ſaith) to auoid the calumnies of the Sabellians; who for this cuſtome reproched the Chriſtians, that they worſhipped three Gods. From whence we may collect, how indifferent things theſe Ceremonies are, ſo long as they are not abuſed: and on the other ſide, how lawfull it is, yea, and how neceſſary, to take away the vſe of them, for preuenting of an inconuenience. So that we may ſay thus much in the Huguenots behalfe; that they doe not in this point ſwarue ſo much from the practice of the ancient Church, ſeeing they doe not condemne thoſe diuers Ceremonies which were practiſed anciently; notwithſtanding, that they doe now forbeare them, eſpecially when they haue obſerued them to change into ſo much ſuperſtition, as that our better learned Catholikes doe euen laugh at the poore people, whom they themſelues haue abuſed.

Chap. 3.

That the doctrine of the Huguenots hath not beene condemned by any lawfull Iudgement, before the Councell of Trent.

Hitherto haue I ſpoken of the Huguenots Religion, as it is in it ſelfe, as well in Doctrine, as in Ceremonies, *viz.* That Ceremonies be things indifferent; And as for their errors in doctrine, that they be not in the foundation of faith. So that they, not being Hereſikes, in reſpect of the wickedneſſe of their opinions; let vs now trauerſe the Indictment, to finde whether they be ſo by condemnation. Now our Aduerſaries to conuict them, produces the Decrees of diuers

ours Councells to which, before I make answer, I will propose these foure considerations.

The first is this: Whether a generall and lawfull Councell, may erre or not in the substance of faith; seeing that it is made vp of men, in whose testimony (as saith Saint *Augustine*) there is so little certaintie; his words be these: *A man may believe the Scriptures without doubting; but for any other testimonies, it is lawfull either to believe them, or not to believe them.* So as this priuiledge, to be of an infallible certaintie, is onely given to the Scriptures: which if it be true, then all the passages which are drawne from the authority of Councells, are thus farre forth onely of weight, as they can bee made good by the Scriptures. Nevertheless, this being the common answer of the Huguenots: I will make no further vse of it; but like a true Catholike, confesse this to be an infallible Maxime; That *a lawfull and generall Councell, cannot erre in the substance of faith.* 1. Consid. Aug. Epist. 119. c. 21.

The second is: Whether if such a generall Councell may erre, though not in the substance of faith; yet at least in other points of Diuinitie of lesse consequence: And if they may erre in these, then, seeing (as I haue shewne) that the Huguenots errors be not in the substance of faith, that it followes hereupon, That the Councels may erre in their definitions decisions of those Controuersies which are betwixt the Huguenots and vs, being onely points of lesser consequence. Whereupon it followes, That this second sort of heresie becomes supernumerary, and their errors not being heresies in their owne nature, cannot be made heresies by ours condemnation. For the reason why hee is counted an Heretike, who resists the Decrees of a Councell is, for that in doing so, he resists the iudgement of the Holy Ghost, which doth still, and infallibly, accompany the Councell. But now, if the holy Ghost bee no further forth promised to assist the Councell; than when it treateth of things necessary to saluation; Then they, who hold some Tenets contrary to the Councell in other things, doe not herein resist the iudgement of the holy Ghost; and by consequence are no Heretikes. *Stapleton*, Professor at the 2. Consid. Stapleton Princip. Doctrin. cont. 4. lib. 8. cap. 13.

Controuerſie at Doway, and one of the moſt learned *Catholikes* of our times, who hath written moſt accurately of this Argument, holdes, That the holy Ghoſt is onely promiſed to aſſiſt the Counſels in neceſſary things, and that in other things they may erre. And *Andradius* himſelfe, who defends the Counſell of *Trent*, in the very ſame Booke wherein he doeth defend it as generall, lawfull and ſound in the matter of Faith, condemnes the vulgar Tranſlation of the Bible, as corrupted, although the ſaid Councell had authorized it for authentical, ſo little did hee truſt to the iudgement of Counſels, in things which were beſide the eſſence of Faith.

Andradius Defens. fid. Trident. lib. 4.

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 3.

3. *Conſ.* But admitting thus much, That a lawfull Councell cannot erre at all, yet is there ſtill a third difficulty, *viz.* Whether theſe Councels which hee produceth againſt the *Huguenots* be lawfull: which euen a *Catholike* may ſafely deny; for as much as there be diuers nullities to be found in them, and namely in their manner of proceeding, which are no where found in the ancient Counſels, as I will ſhew in the next Chapter, when I treat of the Councell of *Trent*. Now, the *Huguenots* will be very well content to be tryed by the Ancient Counſels, held in the firſt 600. yeeres of Chriſt, namely, vntill ſuch time as the Pope (as they ſay) hauing gotten ſo abſolute a Monarchy in the Church, tooke away the liberty of Counſels, and ſubiected the ſuffrages of the other Biſhops to giue with him: now all the Councels alleadged by our Aduerſarie, are ſince that time.

4. *Conſ.* There remaines a fourth difficulty, namely, Whether the *Huguenots* haue beene iuſtly condemned by the latter Counſels. Now vpon theſe foure conſiderations, a man may perceiue how friuolous his brags are of the Counſels, forſmuch as he is able to conclude nothing, vnleſſe he hath leaue granted him before hand to adde what authority to the Counſels he pleaſeth; to make what Counſels lawfull hee liſteth, and to force the Counſels to ſpeake what he would haue them: The moſt innocent man in the World might bee conuicted by ſuch proofes, if a man would beleeue without further examination, whatſoeuer euery witneſſe ſhall bring againſt him:

and

and when his Aduersary also shall haue leaue, both to picke the witnesses at his owne pleasure, and also to iudge of their testimonies.

But to returne to our purpose. Let vs see next, whether the *Huguenots* stand lawfully condemned by those Councels which he produceth, or not. The Catholike Apologie denies it, whereby (in my conceit) hee shewes a great deale of zeale to the *Romane* Religion. For, considering what a world of people are infected with the *Huguenots* doctrine, by reason that it is not yet condemned by any lawfull forme of proceeding, he endeuours to perswade with the Catholikes, to cause a lawfull Councell to be called to confute them, to the end, that the *Huguenots* might bee satisfied by being shewed their errors, and bee left without excuse for reiecting the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. But obseruing that there be many seditious Catholikes (who rather thirst to kill their bodies, then to saue their soules) doe hinder so holy a designe, vnder colour, that they be already condemned by other Councels: The Catholike Apology doth very wel hereby, to aduise them not to desist for all this, but to pursue so good an enterprise; for as much as the former Decrees, by which the *Huguenots* stand condemned, are not of such authoritie, but that they may appeale from them to an higher power. So that we must sue out another Processe against them, to get such a Iudgement as they themselues shall neuer be able to except against. Now our Aduersary answers, that there is no need to take this course, affirming, that they bee indeed cast already by such a Iudgement, which he proues by two reasons. One is, that the Doctrine of the Romane Church hath beene publikely confirmed by generall Councels, before that of *Trent*. The second is, that the *Huguenots* Religion is the same with that of ancient Heretikes, which hath beene heretofore condemned.

For the first, The chiefe Controuersie is (saith hee) about the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which is not onely determined by the Councell of *Trent*, but also by ten most ancient Councels of the Church. To make good which assertion, Transubstantiation.

he cites the Councell of *Vercelles*, *Tours*, *Vienne*, *Constance*, *Florence*; and of foure others, celebrated at *Rome*; the chiefe of which, was that of *Lateran*, vnder *Innocent* the third. And these be the tenne Councels which our Aduersary stiles the most ancient Councels of the Church. Certainly, then was the Church a long time without Councels, for the ancientest of these was 1000 yeeres after the Apostles times. But peraduenture he meanes it onely of the Church of *Rome*, as it is different in doctrine from the ancient Church; which is as much to say, As these Councels are the most ancient of this (Romane) Church, which not long before the celebrating of these Councels, became a new Church, and quite contrary to the former. And in this sense hee doth not account these Councels as simply ancient, but the most ancient onely of that Church, which is not ancient. I can but wonder how he comes to ill aduised, as to giue this aduantage to the *Heretiques*, as so conclude vpon him out of his owne premises; *That our holy mother Church of Rome is a new Church*: and to giue a hint to the vulgar to discouer by his owne confession, that it is so indeed. Which inconuenience, the Author of the Catholike Apology was better aware off to preuent it, for knowing very well, that we are not able to make good the doctrine of the Romane Church by the ancient Councels, he aduiseth rather that we should labour the calling of a new one; lest that by vrging the other, which indeed be not ancient, the common people might come by this meane, to suspect that our doctrine is new.

But to returne to the said Councels: besides this, that they are all new, there be also seuen of the tenne which were neuer receiued for generall, by the most learned defenders of the Romane Religion; and by the opinion therefore of those very Catholikes, they may erre, and by consequence it will be lawfull to appeale from them to a generall Councell. Iust as the opinion of S. *Cyprian* about *Rebaptization*, being condemned as *Rome* in a particular Councell, by Pope *Cornelius*, and the sentence reuoked by Pope *Stephen*; yet did S. *Cyprian* neuertheleſſe continue in his former opinion, accoūting both

the Popes and the Councels of errour; which certainly hee would not haue done, had hee esteemed the authoritie of a particular Councell, without appeale: whereby it appeares, that of those ten Councels which he vrgeth, there bee but three, namely, that of *Lateran*, of *Vienna*, and of *Florence*, which he esteemed generall, euen by the Catholikes themselues: and so by consequence onely three, which haue power definitiuely to determine, and not to be subiect to an appeale to be made from them.

As for the Decree of that Councell of *Lateran*, we ought not to thinke it strange, that the *Huguenots* except against it, seeing that the said Councell, in the iudgement euen of the *Catholikes* themselues, might erre, in the sentence giuen against them; for *Scotus* saith of *Transubstantiation*, That it is but an opinion probable; now an opinion probable, is not necessary; and in determining vpon a Doctrine, which is not necessary, *Stapleton* saith: That a generall Councell may erre; whereby it appeares, that in the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, the Decree of the Councell aforesaid, was not certaine. Can wee imagine then that the *Huguenots* will stand to such a Decree, which the *Catholikes* themselues confesse to be subiect to errour? Councell of *Lateran*.

As for the Councell of *Vienna*, this error (saith he) is condemned in it, which is: *That we ought not to doe any honour or reuerence to the holy Eucharist*, which, as euery man knowes, is the errour of *Caluin*, and of all the *Sacramentaries*. I answer: That our Aduersary, and such as he, doe much iniure the Church of *Rome*, in giuing the *Huguenots* occasion to reproach the *Catholikes*, as to vrge them, that they be lyers and slanderers. For they of the Religion doe not affirme (as hee would make them) that wee ought not to giue any honor or reuerence to the *Eucharist*: but that we should not adore it as the *Catholikes* doe. Councell of *Vienna*.

The last Councell is that of *Florence*: the authority whereof, the *Huguenots* may well accept against him, for that it differs from other Councels. For the Councels of *Basil* and *Constance*, both which our Aduersary rankes here among the generall. Councell of *Florence*.

nerall Councels, haue adiudged it, *That the Authoritie of a Councell is aboue the Pope*: whereas the Councell of *Florence*, makes the Pope aboue the Councell. Which sentence is not onely (as I thinke) contrary to the Councell of *Basil* and *Constance*, but contradictorie also to the iudgement of all the Diuines in Paris at that time. So that if the *Huguenots* doe ill in dissenting from the Councell of *Florence*, they doe it by the example of Catholike Diuines and of other Councels, yea of those which are Generall, by the iudgment euen of our Aduersary himselfe.

Freewill. The second doctrine which he instances in, is that of *Freewill*, for denying of which, the Manichees and other Heretikes stand condemned by S. *Augustine*, S. *Hieronme*, S. *Leo*, &c. Now I answer: That the Huguenots deny it not in the same manner that those Hereticks did, as is to be well seene in the doctrine of the Manichees: who made two necessary Principles; the one of Good, and the other of Euill, and as absolutely denied Freewell, as well of doing ill, as of doing good. But when he can shew, that the Huguenots hold any such opinion, his examples will serue to some purpose.

Further, he confirmes the said opinion by foure other Councels, *viz.* by a particular one held in France, and by those of *Auranches*, *Seni*, and *Constance*. I answer; that it were but an easie matter so to interpret the said Councels, as that the Huguenots need not refuse them in this point of *Freewill*. But for breuities sake, I will not stand to examine them, because that three of them be particular, and for that respect may erre (as I haue shewne before) and may be appealed from: and for the fourth, which is that of *Constance*, though it be called generall by our Aduersarie, yet *Bellarmine* nevertheless receiues but 18 Councels for generall and lawfull, of which ranke this of *Constance* is none.

Children dying without Baptisme. The third heresie that hee speakes of is, That the Huguenots hold, that little Children dying without *Baptisme*, doe not perish; which that they doe, is plaine enough (saith he.) And how? namely, by so many testimonies of Scripture, by so many Decrees of ancient Councels, by so many resolutions

lutions of holy Fathers: And yet does, how allcadge but two passages onely out of S. *Austin*, who indeed as he was of this opinion, That Children could not be saued without Baptisme, so held he likewise, *That they could not be saued without the Eucharist*, Which opinion of his, euen our *Catholikes* themselues doe condemne. Why then should the *Huguenots* be Heretikes rather for dissenting from Saint *Augustine* in one Sacrament, then the *Catholikes* are for disallowing his iudgement in the other?

The fourth point, is, the *Worshipping of Images*: which was confirmed by the second Counsell of *Nice*, vnto which I may well oppose the Councell of *Franckford*, celebrated since that of *Nice*, which both condemned and condemned the authority of that Councell, and the Decrees of it. Neither does it make any thing for our Aduersary, to say, that these testimonies are of weight enough amongst *Catholikes*, for there were none in the Councell of *Franckford* but *Catholikes*, and the Popes Legates themselues, which assisted at it. Obserue then all the Councels which our Aduersary hath rak't together against the *Huguenots*: All of which, excepting those three of *Lateran*, *Vienna*, *Florence*, and this last *Nice*, are particular, and so by consequence, their Decrees may be anulled and reuersed. Further of these foure, which by some are accounted generall, the first (that of *Lateran* I meane) was by the sentence of *Scotus* and *Stapleton* (two grand Catholikes) subiect vnto error. The words he vrgeth out of the second, (*viz.* that of *Vienna*) are nothing to the purpose. The iudgement of the third (which is that of *Florence*) is contrary to the Decrees of the Councels of *Basile* and *Constance*. The last of *Nice* was condemned by that of *Franckford*: wherefore then should the *Huguenots* giue way to the authority of such Councels, from whom the Catholikes themselues, yea Councels also of Catholikes themselues, doe disagree. How can wee hope then to conuert them by such proofes? Let vs call a new one then, let vs giue indifferent audience to their Ministers: let vs refute their Arguments to their very faces; else shall wee neuer recall the *Huguenots*, that are

gone

gone astray into the right way.

2. That the Doctrine of the *Huguenots* is not the same with that of the ancient Heretikes already condemned.

The second reason, whereby our Aduersarie confutes the *Huguenots*, is; Because they agree in doctrine with the ancient Heretikes, *viz.* the Arrians, who (as Saint *Augustine* testifies) reiected, 1. Prayers for the dead: 2. The set times of Fasting: 3. The difference betwixt the Bishop and the ordinary Priest: And 4. with *Iouinian* and *Vigilantius*, in the point of Continency and Virginitie: 5. Merits and rewards of Saints: 6. The Adoration of Reliques: 7. The Inuocation of Saints: 8. The Election of Meats. I answer. First, That euen as a good *Catholike* may erre, so may an Heretike also speake truth. Saint *Cyprian* and *Ticonius* the Donatist, hauing diuersly interpreted a place of the holy Scriptures, Saint *Augustine* reiects Saint *Cyprians* exposition, and allowes that of *Ticonius*. So that it is not enough barely to shew that an Heretike hath maintained such and such an opinion, vnlesse he proue withall, that the said opinion is heretical. Secondly, I haue shewed in the former Chapter, that the vse of things indifferent, might be lawfull in the ancient Church, and yet vnlawfull in this of ours: so that the *Huguenots* may iustly blame the selfe-same things which the said Heretikes did vniustly except against, vntill we can proue, not onely the things to be the same, but also make it appeare, that there is not now a greater abuse, in the same things, than there was then. As for the opinions following, the *Huguenots* will affirme, that neither did the Fathers hold them in the same manner that the *Catholikes* now do, nor that the Heretikes tooke the same exceptions to them, that the *Huguenots* now doe: as wee may perceiue by the exceptions following.

Retract. lib. 2. cap. 17.

Prayer for the dead.

First, as for *Prayer for the Dead*, the *Huguenots* will affirme, That the Church in the beginning, celebrated onely a Commemoration of the dead, wherein (as I shewed in the former Chapter) they made mention likewise of the Apostles, and of those that be already gone to heauen. Now this Commemoration (will the *Huguenots* say) brought forth Prayer for the dead, this Prayer brought forth Purgatorie, Purgatory, Pardons, and Pardons haue brought in pence into the Popes

coffers.

offers. Now will they say further, that so long as these abuses were not in the Church, if any man had found fault with this custome, of Commemoration, he should but haue shewed himselfe to be of a quarrelsome spirit; yea, they will further say, that perie abuses, especially such as beare a shew of Charitie, might somewhat be winked at, as Prayer for the Dead, had: which custome serued then also to stirre vp in the Pagans, a better esteeme of the Christian faith: but this occasion being now ceased, and the abuses remaining so great, as they affirme them to be; tis now no time to winke at them any longer, nor is there any other meanes left vs, to reforme them, than to take away the first occasion whence they proceeded, thogh in themselues they be of no great consequence. So that if we will shew wherein the Huguenots resemble the other ancient Heretickes, in taking exceptions vnto prayer for the dead, we must shew withall, how that the ancient Church vsed the same chaffering for Pardons and Indulgences, for the deliuering of soules out of Purgatorie, that the Church of Rome at this day doth. Otherwise, the abuse being not the same, the things deserue not equall blame, and they that finde fault with them are not alike faultie.

2. Set fasting daies.

Touching set fasting daies, I am heartily sorrie, that he, in giuing out, that the Huguenots doe herein imitate the ancient Heretickes, giues them aduantage to reuenge themselues vpon vs, and to proue the cleane contrary; namely, that it is we that follow the ancient Heretikes: for *Eusebius* saith, *That it was Montanus the Heretike*, who first set downe the *Rules for Fasting*, seeing that before that, these set fasting daies were not ordained with any intention to binde the consciences, but for orders sake onely. Surely then he was not in the right, whosoeuer found fault with them, seeing there was at first no superstition in them. But since that (say the Huguenots) the superstition is come to that height, that the very day, only because it is such, or such a Saints Eue, is esteemed much holier than other daies. So then, this order hauing occasioned superstition, to auoid this superstition, wee may dispose otherwise of that order. *Euseb. 5. 16.*

3. Distinction of Bishops and Priests.

And now as concerning the difference betweene the Bishop and the ordinary Priest; the Huguenots will say, that at first they were both equall: but that since then, some amongst them haue beene promoted to dignitie aboue the rest, and at last one is become Monarch ouer them all. Now (will the Huguenots confesse) that before this vniuersall Monarchy of the Pope, there was not the like reason to blame the distinction of degrees in Pastors, which in it selfe was tolerable, and not altogether vnprofitable: But they will say withall, that it is most manifest, how that the Fathers neuer held this distinction to haue beene instituted by God, but onely to be a positiue ordinance of men, so preserue (as Saint *Ierome* saith) the vnitie of the Church. A Priest (saith he) is the same with a Bishop, but it was afterwards ordained throughout the world, that one should be made choice of aboue the rest, for the auoiding of Schisme. Howbeit he confesseth that Bishops are superior to Priests, by Custome rather, than by diuine Ordination.

Comment in cap. 2. Epist. ad Titum.

4. Marriage and Virginitie.

The fourth point, wherein he saith that the Huguenots doe imitate the ancient Heretikes, is concerning *Marriage* and *Virginitie*, which is but a meere calumny: for the Huguenots affirme not with *Iouinian*, That mariage is simply equall to Virginitie; but onely in such a sense as Saint *Augustine* speakes it, who sayes, that he dares not preferre the virginitie of Saint *Iohn* before the marriage of *Abraham*. Nor with *Vigilantius*, that it is vnlawfull so make a Priest, vnlesse he were first married: but with that holy man *Paphnutius*, That it is lawfull for a Priest to be married.

5. Merits of Saints.

Touching the *Merits and rewards of the Saints*, I cannot tell what he would say: for if he meanes by it, That the Saints become a recompence of their good workes, the Huguenots will agree to it: but if he meanes it of *workes of supererogation*, laid vp (as they say) in the treasury of the Church, and applied by the Popes Indulgences, vnto the soules of other men; the Catholikes will say, that the Church liued in the same ignorance for the first thousand yeares, that the Huguenots now dot: for it is not long since that for the benefit and aduance-

ment

meht of the Pope, God first reuealed this treasure, which had lyen hid so long, and the most gainefull commoditie of Indulgences also.

Now as for *Reliques*, I say that euen the same Saint *Hieromr* who wrote against *Vigilantius* for taking exception to the Reliques of Saints, doth yet in the same booke against *Vigilantius*, allow of the Eues of Saints: howbeit for certaine abuses committed in the night of the said Eues, which they called the *Vigils*, the Catholikes themselues haue forbidden them: And now fast onely vpon the Eues, although the daies doe still retaine the names of Eues. So then we must either grant that the Catholikes are condemned by Saint *Hierome*, as wel as the Huguenots; or else that the abuse of things, causeth them to be thought blame worthy at one time, and not at another. So that we must not consider whether the Huguenots agree with *Vigilantius*, in the taking exception to Reliques; but whether there bee not now more abuse in the worshipping of them, then in Saint *Heroms* time. For the Huguenots doe not now simply accept against Reliques, insomuch that I haue heard diuers Huguenots say, That if they could bee certaine that they had any ancient monument of our Sauiour, or of his Apostles, they would make very precious esteeme of them: and farre more, than of any antique medall or other antiquitie of the old Romanes. By greater reason then doe they honour their persons, although they do not inuoke them being dead, for that (say they) themselues forbad it whilst they liued. So that if we will proue the Huguenots to be enemies to the honour of the Apostles, wee must proue out of their writings, That such was their will to be inuocated. Else will the Huguenots tell vs, That they haue the Saints in more honour than the Catholikes; in that they haue such a care to obserue their precepts now after their deaths: It being euident, That that child who is most carefull to performe his last will and testament, loues his deceased father best, than if hee should onely keepe his picture by him.

6. 7. Worshipping of Saints and their Reliques.

The eight and last opinion of the ancient Heretikes, is, *The election of meats*. Whereunto the Huguenots will giue the same

8. Election of meats.

same answer as to the former obiections: *viz.* that it was vnlawful in those times to finde faulte with the election of meats, and yet lawfull to condemne it now. The reason is, for that it was then an order onely, without enforcing of the conscience to obserue it.

And if any man reply, That they now in the Church doe but the same, and that it is onely the meaner sort of people that account one meat holier than another: and that the better learned Catholikes hold, that the sin of eating flesh vpon dayes whereon it is forbidden, is onely in regard of the ordinance, and not in regard of the nature of the meats: Whence comes it then, that *Durandus* that great defender of the ceremonies of our Church, makes vse of this reason, to confirme abstinence from eating of flesh; namely, That fish is a more holy meat: for that in the time of *Noahs* flood, God cursed the earth, and the creatures that it brought forth, but not the waters.

Durand. lib. 6. de alijs rituum.

See here now the ancient heresies reuiued (as he saith) by the Huguenots: but hee is in the wrong: for that they ought not to be ranked amongst the Heretikes, vntill such time as we haue made proofe, how that the Church of Rome doth not onely agree with the Primitiue in the same things, but also in the very circumstances of the things: for those things which are of themselues ceremonies, are also of themselues indifferent; and it is the right vse or abuse of them, which makes them lawfull or vnlawfull. So that by consequence, it may be at this time lawfull, and at another time vnlawfull, to take exceptions to them; Euen as it was not lawfull to breake the brazen Serpent, whilst it was a Sacrament, but necessarie to breake it, when it became an Idoll.

Simile.

CAP. 4.

That the Councell of Trent is not lawfull.

WE are come at last, thankes bee to God, to the holy Councell of *Trent*; a Councell whereof our Aduersaries had need to make good account, for that the proofes drawne from the former Councells, concerned only two or three questions; and those also, rather probable coniectures, than proofes. But as for the Councell of *Trent*, that openly confutes all the heresies now maintained by the Huguenots; by reason whereof, our Aduersarie toyles himselfe more in the defence of that, than in any other question whatsoeuer: albeit hee vses not any proofes to confirme it, but answers onely to the obiections of the *Catholike Apologie*, which he findes to bee three in number.

The first is; That the Pope did therein take vpon him the office both of Iudge and Partie: and that himselfe conuoked the Councell, and sat President in it. 1.

The second is; That those who sought the reformation, could not be heard in it. 2.

The third; That for as much as the Huguenots are able to alledge diuers nullities, both in the forme, and also in the definitions of the said Councell; we are not bound to accept of the ordinances thereof, without examination of them: For as much as S. *Iohn* hath commanded vs to *try the Spirits*. 3.

To the first Obiection: That the Pope was both Iudge and Partie, he answers; That the Pope ought not to lose his right of calling Councels, and of being President in them, for that he had obtained this right 2500 yeares before. The Huguenots can easily cut him off 500 yeares of his time. In al which space, the Pope neither once called any generall Councell, nor sat President in it. The first of *Nice* was called by *Constantine* the Great. That of *Constantinople* by *Theodosius* Senior: That of *Ephesus*, by *Theodosius* Iunior: That of *Chalcedon*, by

Martianus, the Emperour. The same also may bee affirmed of those that sat President in them. In the Councell of *Nice* was *Hosius* Bishoppe of *Cordoba* in *Spaine*, President. In the Councell of *Ephesus*, *Cyril*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*. And thus much may suffice for so evident a truth.

Secondly, he answers; That is is nothing repugnant to the equitie of a great Prince, to bee both Iudge and Partie. In so much as a Soueraigne Prince is perpetually Iudge, vntill he be lawfully declared to haue forfeited his principalitie, although the suite bee commenced against himselfe. But I say, that there is still a third, which arbitrates betwixt the Prince and his Subiects, when there is a suit betweene them: And although the Iudge be the Princes Officer, yet may he pronounce sentence against him, *which himselfe cannot repeale: and there is no Prince, but a Tyrant, that would reuerse that iudgment, as the Pope hath done in disanulling the decrees of the Councels of *Basil* & *Constance*, made against himselfe. But admit I should confesse, that a Prince might bee Iudge in his owne cause; yet ought that to bee vnderstood in a suit of meane consequence: but when the controuersie is, whether he be a lawfull King or not, we may well assure our selues, that he would neuer be deposed, if he might be his owne arbitrator: and of this nature is the first Article of the processe against the Pope. The Huguenots deny him to be head of the church; How then I pray shall this Controuersie be decided, if there be no other Iudge besides himselfe?

*En denier ressort.

Thirdly, he shewes by examples, that Pope *Marcelline*, *Sixtus* the third, *Symachus*, *Leo*, *Alexander*, Patriarch of Alexandria, *Cyril*, and *Leo* the first, were Iudges in their owne causes. As for S. *Marcelline* (saith he) when as he had offered Incense vnto Idols, hee went and accused himselfe in the Councell of *Sinuessa*, and yet durst no man denounce Sentence against him, but all the Bishops cryed out with one consent: *Father iudge thy selfe with thine own mouth*. To which I answer: That is is easie to discouer this to be but a forged Counsell, which brings in the Emperor *Diocletian*, talking with S. *Marcelline*

Marcellinus at Rome, and enioying him to idolatry; whereas *Diocletian* was at the same time at *Nicomedia*, a Citie of *Bithinia*. Secondly, there is a great deale of difference betweene a plaine case, & a right in question. For S. *Marcellinus* was accused of an act, of which he was most apparently guilty? So that the Bishops perceiuing that the Pope denied not the fact, and that he was penitent for it, offered to referre themselues to that sentence which he would giue against himselfe. Iust as if a man should say to a Theefe that were taken in the manner; Thou seest thy selfe openly guiltie, thou knowest likewise the punishment ordained by the law for such offences, What thinkest thou that thou hast deserued? Speake a Gods name, and be thine owne Iudge: Surely this would be verie acceptable to all malefactors, to conclude thereupon, that they should haue no other Iudges goe vpon them but themselues. His second example of *Sixtus* the third, who being (saith he) accused of Adulcery, would haue a Synod called by th'Emperors authoritie. But they would not, nor indeed durst they (saith hee) meddle with his Cause before all the Bishops were met, and that they vnderstood the Popes pleasure, whether hee were willing to haue them so decide his businesse, or not. I answer; that this was but a singular fauour shewne him by the Emperour *Valentinian*, by reason of his innocency: For the Pope himselfe was willing that other men should haue beene Iudges in his businesse: But it followes not hereupon, that euery Pope in euery cause ought to claime the same priuiledge; but the contrarie rather: *viz.* That Pope *Sixtus* the first, who would not suffer himselfe to bee iudged by any other man, ought to haue beene so, because *Sixtus* the third, who would haue beene so, was not. What necessitie is there in censuring him, whose innocency is cleare; and as it was a token of innocency in the one to submit himselfe vnto censure, so to refuse all mens verdicts, but his owne, is an euidence, that he findes himselfe guiltie. But I demand now, whether that singular priuiledge granted vnto *Sixtus*, must henceforth be taken for a leading cause or not? If he answers no, then is this instance

Sigonius de occidentis Imp. l. 13.

nothing

nothing to his purpose: if yea, The Catholikes will oppose it, for *Bellarmine* confesseth, that in case of heynous crimes, a Councell may be called to sit vpon the Pope: But he thinkes not peraduenture that *Sixtus* was accused of any heynous crime: which (as I thinke) is the reason that he names not his fault; because he barely insinuates, that he was accused of Adultery; whereas indeede, he was accused for defiling of a Nunne; which wee good Catholikes, stile not Adultery, but Incest; by reason of the spirituall consanguinitie which is betwixt a Priest and a Nunne.

Tom. 1. Cont. 4. lib. 4. cap. 9.

His third example of *Symachus*, whose consent (saith he) was required euen for the calling of that Councell, wherein himselfe was accused. The Huguenots will desire no more at the Popes hands, than to doe as *Symachus* did; for, albeit his consent were to the calling of the Councell; yet when it was called, he tooke not vpon him the part of a Iudge in it, but with all humblenesse purged himselfe before the Councell of those crimes which he was charged withall.

The fourth example is of *Leo* the third, of which passage the truth is this: The Romanes bearing a spleene to *Leo*, for that *Charlemaigne* the Emperour had inforced them to sweare allegeance to him, out of meere malice laid many slanders vpon him; But *Charlemaigne* appearing at Rome, they, for feare of him, durst not stand to it to prosecute their proofes against him, but at the very first assaulte they all cried out; *That the Apostles See could not be iudged by any man.* Which clamour testifies nothing else, then, *That it is the nature of the vulgar, to fall from one extreme to another.* And therefore they having slandered the Pope before out of malice, they afterwards thought to curry fauour againe, by flattering him for feare. But let vs heare what followes: Did not *Arrius* (saith he) heretofore dispute the case in a matter of faith with *Alexander*? Notwithstanding was this *Alexander* iudge in the Councell of *Nice*. Was not *Cyrill* President in the Councell of *Ephesus*, notwithstanding he was one of the parties? And who but *Leo* sat President at the Councell of *Chalcedon*, notwithstanding that all the difference then was betwixt him

and

and *Dioscorus*? I answer: That the controuersies which then were betwixt *Alexander*, *Cyril*, *Leo*, and the foresaid Heretikes, concerned them no more then it did the rest of the Bishops of the Church: whereas that of the Pope is a priuate quarrell, wherein the dignity of his person is questioned. Againe, *Cyril* was not President of the Councell, so as that hee could allow or anull the Decrees as hee thought good; but sate only first in order, hauing otherwise but his single voice; whereas the Pope now adayes hath his negatiue voice to disanull a whole Councell though generall: yea, and to make his Decretals vpon what hee list, without a Councell. As for *Alexander*, he sate neither as Iudge nor President, but onely as a priuate Bishop amongst the rest. To conclude, *Leo* came not at all to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and *Anatolius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople* sate President in it.

His concluding reason why the Pope may be Iudge, is; because (as he saith) he is not Iudge alone, but hath diuers Assistants. I answer: That in the latter Councels he hath been sole Iudge: and that the rest of the Bishops haue not been so much his Assistants, as his Vassals. For, whatsoeuer the Councell decrees, is void, without the confirmation of the Pope be to it, (witnesse his abrogation of the Councels of *Francksford*, *Basil*, and *Constance*.) Contrariwise, whensoeuer the Pope makes a Decree without a Councell, it is of as much vertue as the definitions of the most holy Councell that euer was or can be. For the Popes aduocates maintaine, that he cannot erre in a matter of faith, though he should giue iudgement without a Councell: and that a Councell may erre, if not confirmed by him. To what purpose then serue the other Bishops ioyned with him as companions, when as hee may doe all without them, and they nothing without him?

The second Obiection of the Catholike Apologie, viz. That the *Huguenots* had not faire audience: is first (saith he) confuted by that very booke which the Protestants set forth, intituled, *Confessio Electorum*: for they confesse in that Booke that they were *summoned* to the Councell. And wee may reade moreouer of many ample safe conducts, whereby full

liberty was giuen to the Protestants, to come to the Councell, And this briefly is his answer: to which I reply:

First, that the booke which he mentions, deliuers no reason why they came not to the Councell, but why they iudged that the forme of proceeding in that Councell was like to be such, as that their comming thither would haue beene to no purpose. But to what end answers hee, that they were summoned? The Apology affirmes not, that they were not called, but that they were not heard. For it is not enough for a Iudge to call both the parties before him, if he suffers but one of them to speak: and iust this fell it out at that Counsel of *Trent*: for *Brentius*, and other Diuines of *Swetia*, were sent thither by the Duke of *Wittenberge*, but might not bee suffered to dispute when they came there. *Melanthon* also, and other Ministers of *Saxony*, were vpon the way, but turned backe againe, hauing receiued intelligence from *Mauritius*, the Electors Ambassador there, that they could not be heard.

Secondly, I reply; that admit that they had bin suffered to dispute, and had bin heard, yet were the Conditions altogether vnequall, for they requiring to haue a deciding voice with the rest of the Councell, according to the forme of the safe conduct granted to the *Bohemians* by the Councell of *Basill*. But the *Tridentine* Fathers would none of that; refusing to admit of any to haue decisiue voices, but only the Catholike Diuines.

Thirdly, the *Huguenots* had good cause to suspect the safe conduct; for *Iohn Hus* had also a safe conduct from the Emperour *Sigismund*, to come to the Councell of *Constance*; and yet comming thither, was there burnt.

Obiect. 3. To the third Obiection, *viz. That the Apostle commands vs to try the spirits whether they be of God, or no*: he answers; That the Apostle there speakes not of such things as be already certaine, and defined in the Church: but of matters rather vpstart and ambiguous, as are those of our trecherous Aduersaries. Soft and faire, not too fast; there is no man affirmes, that we must try a thing that is certaine; but that we are not to settle our beliefe vpon it, without proofs that it is certain. For a thing may be certaine in it selfe; neuertheless, if it does not appeare

to

to be certaine vnto vs, we may well make triall of it, for that without trying, we cannot vnderſtand the certainty. But it is (ſaith he) lawfull to try the *Huguenots* opinions, becauſe they be new and ambiguous. If then it be lawfull to try the new, tis alſo lawfull (ſay I) to try the old; for two oppoſite *Opinions* are *Relatiues*; ſo that we cannot make demonſtration that the new are falſe, but we muſt proue withall, that the old are true. And as for the ambiguity of the *Huguenots* doctrine, if it be ambiguous, then is it not certainely falſe; and if their doctrine be not certainely falſe, then is not the *Catholikes* certainly true: and conſequently, euen by the iudgement of our Aduerſary himſelfe, it is lawfull to try it. But let vs now examine his reaſons vpon which he concludes, that it is not lawfull to try the Spirits of the Councell.

Firſt (ſaith he) if we ought to try them all, then were it lawfull to try the Spirits of the Councell of *Nice*, *Conſtantinople*, *Epheſus*, & *Chalcedon*: Whereupon it muſt follow, that wee ought to diſcuſſe againe the wicked hereſies of *Arrius*, *Macedonius*, *Neſtorius*, and *Eutiches*, and examine againe the ſacred Scriptures themſelues, the Oracles of the Prophets, the Hiſtory of *Moſes*, and finally the holy Goſpell. At length he concludes, That if things which be determined by the holy Councels, ought to be held for certaine, there is no reaſon to ſuffer the Decrees of the Councell of *Trent* to be called againe into queſtion. I anſwer, That we ought to hold the Decrees of the former Councels for moſt certaine; and yet is it lawfull neuertheleſſe, to make queſtion of the determinations of the Councell of *Trent*: to which purpoſe diuers reaſons might be alledged; howbeit, this one may ſuffice for the preſent: For that in euery Councell, we ought to deliberate and meaſure things, before we iudge; and after this, the iudgement of a Councell which hath duly examined and iudged, (according to the right meaſure) ought not to bee called againe in queſtion. But to know now, whether a man hath truly meaſured, we muſt take conſideration of the ſize and manner of meaſuring by it. Now will the *Huguenots* ſay, that the Rule which the Councell of *Nice* did meaſure by, was onely the

Scripture, or the written Word, as the words of *Constantine* as doe testifie: which be these, *All seditious contention set a-*
Theod. l. 1. c. 7. *side, let vs discusse the things in controuersie by the testimony of the Scriptures diuinely inspired.* The manner of measuring then was, to apply the Doctrine to the said Rule or Scripture; and accordingly to receiue or reiect it, as it was conformable or varying, to or from the said Rule. But now hath the Councell of *Trent* (will the *Huguenots* say) much failed in all these circumstances.

For first, it decided before it measured, for as much as euen before their comming to the Councell, they were euery man of them, resolued to condemne the *Huguenots*. Secondly, in examining and measuring of the questions, it measured not by the written Word onely, but by *Traditions* also, as it was agreed vpon at the fourth Session of the said Councell. So that it measured sometimes, either without a Rule, or at least by a Rule very contrary to that of the Councell of *Nice*. Thirdly, admit that it had measured by a true Rule; yet did it not so much apply the doctrine to the Rule, as bend the Rule, to make it fit to the doctrine, *viz.* peruerted the Scripture by an interpretation forced to their owne opinion: For in the fourth Session, it was decreed, *That no man should giue any other interpretation, then that which was consonant to the Doctrine of the Church of Rome.* So that in stead of measuring their doctrine by the Rule, they measured the Rule by their doctrine.

2. *Reason.* But he followes it further against the triall of the Spirits; that if we should try all, then should we call againe into question, the very Bookes of the holy Scripture it selfe. I answer no; and that it followes not, that wee should call in question againe the Bookes approued by ancient Councels, because they reiect some, which are approued by the Councell of *Trent*; seeing that in this particular; the iudgement of that Councell, is suspected euen by *Catholikes* themselues. For *Sixtus Senensis* a great *Catholike*, yea, euen since the Councell of *Trent*, hath reiected for *Apocryphall*, the seuen last Chapters of the Book of *Hester*, which were approued by the Councell of *Trent*; which doubtlesse he would neuer haue done, had he

he held it vnlawfull to try the Spirit of the ſaid Councell.

Thirdly he argueth, that if matters already determined and defined, may be brought in queſtion againe, what end then would there be of Controuerſies? I anſwer, that this reaſon is not ſufficient to ſtay the triall of Councels, becauſe that this is the way to ſet an end to Controuerſies: for that is not enough to diſpatch Controuerſies, vnleſſe we be ſure that this diſpatching, is a well ending of them. And ſo the Arrians might euen as well haue perſwaded vs, to rely vpon their packt Councell of *Ariminum*, to giue an end to Controuerſies. To which our Aduerſary can ſhape no other anſwer, but that their Councell was not lawfull, and that the Councell of *Trent* was. Well then (ſay I) that though we may not examine the Decrees of a Councell, yet may we try whether the Councell were lawfull or not: and for this once, we deſire no more aduantage then this; and thus much muſt be granted vs in deſpight of the World. For if we ought ſimply to rely vpon the Authority of Councels, which commonly paſſe for lawfull amongſt our Doctors, without any further enquiry; there is no reaſon wherefore the Grecians ſhould rather aſſent to the ſecond Councell of *Nice*, which allowed of Images; then to that of *Conſtantinople*, made vp of 300. of their owne Biſhops, which condemned them. 3. *Reaſon.*

The fourth Reaſon, for which he takes away the liberty of trying their doctrine, from the people, is quoted out of the 17. chapter of *Deuteronomy*, where it is commanded, That men ſhould enquire of the Prieſts and Leuites, and the Iudge appointed for the time in caſes of difficulty. And *Moſes* (ſaith our Aduerſary) addeth not, *Try the Spirits of the Prieſts and Iudges; But if any grow proud, and will not obey the commaund of the Prieſts, that man ſhall die, by the ſentence of the Iudge.* Nor is this much different from that which our Lord ſaith in the Goſpell of Saint *Matthew*, *The Scribes and Phariſes ſit in Moſes Chayre, whatſoeuer therefore they ſay vnto you, that obſerue and doe.* As for *Moſes* Commandement, it was giuen vnto the *Iewes*; whereupon *Rabbi Salomon Iarchi* concludes, *That wee are to beleeue whatſoeuer the Iewiſh Prieſts ſay.* Since then 4. *Reaſon.* *Rab. Sal. Iarchi in Deuteronom.*

then that their Priests interpreted the Prophecies, euen of Christ himselfe, otherwise then we Christians doe: A Iew will say that Christ is not yet come, because their Priests deny it; and if according to our Aduersaries saying, we ought not to try the Spirits of their Priests; I demand then, how he will answer the *Iewes*, and I will answer him, as hee does them; namely, that in the Text this clause is inserted, *According to Law*, that is to say, we are to obey their Commandements, so farre forth, as they are agreeable to the Law; which how can we know, vnlesse we examine it? So that let our Aduersary take his choyce; either to confesse, that wee are not in this place forbidden to try the Spirits of the Priests, or else to acknowledge himselfe to be a Iew.

5. Reason. To the place of Saint *Matthew*, because he saith, how that it is not much vnlike: our answer shall likewise be the same. For our Sauiour hath not commanded vs to obey the Pharises in all things, simply; but not to take such scandall at their liues, as that we should refuse to obey them, when they speake well. For, should we simply giue credit to what they bid vs, Mat. 17. without tryall of it, why should we beleeue that Iesus Christ is the Sonne of God, when as the high Priest said that he blasphemed, in calling himselfe so?

His last reason is drawne from the Councell of the Apostles mentioned, *Acts* 15. *It seemed good vnto the holy Ghost, & to vs:* Whence he concludes, *That Gods Spirit is so infallibly tyed vnto a lawful Councel, that we ought not to call the definitions of it into question:* nor would Saint *Paul* himselfe (saith our Aduersary) examine the instructions of the Councell of the Apostles: as Saint *Luke* saith, *Acts* 16. *He gaue them that to obserue, which was ordained by the Apostles and the Elders which were at Ierusalem.* I would faine aske one of our *Catholike* Doctors, to what purpose are there so many disputations and consultations at our Councels, if so be that the holy Ghost doth so infallibly direct them? His answer will be, That Gods ordinary prouidence is such, as that he still assists them with his Spirit, when they for their parts, apply that diligence, which they ought, and not otherwise; Iust as hee makes not the

ground

ground fruitfull, but when the husbandman tils and fowes his corne in it, and applies such labour as the soyle requires. And thus much is cleare by this passage: namely, That the Apostles did apply all industry and the aptest meanes, for the resoluing of the doubts propoſed: for it is said, That after a long disputation *Peter* stood vp: whence a man may conclude; That the holy Ghoſt is no otherwiſe promiſed to a Councell, then conditionally; *viz.* when the Councell doth apply all the meanes and industry on their parts, for the finding out of the truth; and that otherwiſe it may be deſtitute of Gods Spirit; namely, when it doth not apply the meanes. So that albeit we are not to examine the Decrees of that Councell, which hath vſed theſe meanes; yet may wee enquire whether it hath applied theſe meanes or no; for that we cannot be otherwiſe aſſured that Gods Spirit did aſſiſt it. The *Hugenots* I know well, will require another manner of tryall; not onely of the courſe in the proceedings, but of the Articles alſo concluded vpon. But that the *Hugenots* may not haue a two-fold aduantage againſt vs, we ſhould doe well to ſhew them; firſt, That the Councell of *Trent* hath obſerued theſe lawfull courſes; and then ſhall we haue but one thing to doe, which is, to make good the Articles; which are ſo difficult to be proued, that it would be wiſely done of vs, to put it off as long as wee can. And firſt to decide all other differences.

CAP. 5.

That the Councel of Trent hath not as yet bin receiued in France.

EVen as the Kings of France ought to haue no one thing in greater recommendation, then to be the inheritors of the vertues of their predeceſſors; ſo ſhould they not likewiſe bee more carefull of any thing, then to eſchew ſuch occaſions as might ſoyle the reputation of this vertue, and bewray them to haue cooled in the zeale and piety

piety of their Anceſtors: who (as all know) haue euer beene accounted the eldeſt ſonnes of the Church, and the maine vpholders of the Sea Apoſtolique: and for that one reaſon of this their zeale, haue receiued more priuiledges and honours, then any other Prince of Chriſtendome whatſoeuer. Now then, ſeeing that the Councell of *Trent* hath eſtabliſhed ſo many decrees, ſo directly oppoſing the former priuiledges and honours; what hath it done more by ſo doing, then to proclaime to the world, That the Kings at this day haue leſſe zeale then their Anceſtors had, and are therefore vnworthy to enioy thoſe honors beſtowed vpon them. So that the reaſon why our later Kings haue reiected the ſaid Councell, may be, for that they could not well approue of that, without reprouing of themſelues; nor publiſh it, without publiſhing alſo vnto the world, a ſhamefull confeſſion of their owne demerits. But to come to the point; I purpoſe onely to buckle to the obiections of the Catholike Apology, which our Aduerſary offers to confute; and thoſe be three.

1 That the Kings of *France* haue euer refuſed that Councel.

2 That it hath called in queſtion the precedency & priority of place, which was due vnto our Kings in all aſſemblies.

3 That there be diuers things decreed in the ſaid Councell flatly againſt the liberties of the French Church, and the Maieſtie of the King.

1. *Obiect.* As for the firſt point, namely, that it hath neuer beene receiued by our Kings: he anſwers to it in generall; *That this Obiection touches not ſo much the Councell, as it reproacheth the Kings of France. For what elſe can this meane* (ſaith he) *then to perſwade all men, that our Kings haue beene Schiſmaticks, and diſobedient to the Vniuerſall Church?* I anſwer, that it is no newes to haue the Kings of *France* oppoſe themſelues againſt the Councels of the Church of Rome: ſeeing that not the Councell of *Trent* alone, hath beene refuſed by King *Henry* the ſecond, and all his Sonnes who reigned after him; but euen the generall Councell of *Vienne* alſo, was neuer wholly receiued in *France*. And euen as King *Henry* the ſecond, forbad his Biſhops to be preſent at the Councell of *Trent*, ſo would

would not King *Charles* the seuenth suffer his to be present at that of *Basil*: and yet was not hee any whit the more a Schismatike (as our Aduersary concludes) nor disobedient to the Church vniuersall. But let vs see now, how he demonstrates the Councell of *Trent* to haue beene receiued by our Kings: *There be certaine Letters* (saith he) *of Charles the ninth yet to be seene, in which he honoureth and reuereweth that Councell:* and in the very same page, to answer that obiection of K. *Henry* the second forbidding his Bishops to repaire vnto that Councell, he hauing nothing else to say; then *That it is not so necessarie to looke so narrowly into what King* Henry *did at the beginning; for, that the admitting or receiuing of a Councell, ought not to be taken from the beginning but from the ending of it.* According to which rule I also answer, That the Letters sent by *Charles* the ninth, before the Councell broke vp, doe not proue his approbation of the Councell, because he refused to receiue it, when it was fully ended. For if the reiecting of it by King *Henry* the second before the end of it, does not proue that hee did finally reiect it; no more doth that honour which *Charles* the ninth did it, before it broke vp, proue that hee did receiue it. 1. *Reason.*

Secondly, *The King* (saith hee) *shewed the reason why the Bishops of France came no sooner to the Councell*; which is one of the most pleasant Arguments that yet I euer heard. For if this be a sufficient reason to proue that the King did receiue the Councell, because hee gaue a reason for the absence of his Bishops; then haue the Protestant Princes of Germany also receiued it, because they publisht a whole booke of the reasons that moued them to absent themselues from thence. 2. *Reason.*

Thirdly; *The King* (sayes he) *sent his Orator and Ambassador the Sieur de Lanssac, Knight of his owne Order, thither; who on his Maiesties name was at the Councel; with whom he ioyned in commission Reginald Ferrier President of the Parliament, and Guy de Faur, Indge Master of Tholouse.* A goodly proofe, The King approued of the Councell, because hee sent his Ambassador thither. As though the Electors of Germany of the confession of *Ausburgh*, sent not their Ambassadors thi- 3. *Reason.*

ther also? Where then lyes the force of his Argument, is it in this, that *Monsieur de Lansacke* was a Knight of the Order? or in this, That he was accompanied by *Monsieur du Ferrier* and *de Pibrac*? For no other sense can I collect out of his words, nor any other proofe for the receiuing of the Councell; nor is there indeed any other. For the King sent not his Ambassadors to the Councell to confirme it, but to admonish it, to reforme the abuses of the Church; giuing expresse charge vnto his Ambassadors, that they should sollicite the Fathers, not to decree any thing against the *Huguenots*, vntill they themselues had first of all reformed the abuses in the Ecclesiasticall Policy: And in case that this were not done, then that they should protest against the said Councell: all which appeares in the Letters which the King himselfe sent vnto *Monsieur du Ferrier*. See here then the briefe of the Kings Commission, and of *Monsieur du Ferrier*, and *de Pibrac*, their Orations in the Councell. They both, and *Monsieur du Ferrier* especially, often in the Kings name requiring the reformation of the abuses of the Church. Which admonitions for that the Councell did reiect, they according to their Kings command, reiected the Councell, and refused to subscribe to it, nor did the King afterwards receiue it, or the Court of Parliament euer publish it; no not after that Saint *Bartholomews* day, when the time seemed most importune to fauour any thing, that might be preiudiciall to the *Huguenots*.

The Massacre anno Dom. 1572.

But at least the Bishops haue approued it: *For when the decrees of it were openly read in the last Session, the Bishops were present, and gaue their voyces and suffrages.*

4. Reason.

I answer first, that so farre was the consent of the Bishops from confirming of the Councell, that quite contrary it discouers the vniust proceedings of it. For those Bishops that gaue their voyces to it in the last Session, gaue their sentence deliberatiue vpon the points which had beene treated vpon in the former Sessions, vnder *Paulus* the third, and *Iulius* the third, before that the said Bishops came to the Councell; a thing contrary to all Ciuill Law, to equity it selfe, and to the customes of all the Parliaments, high Courts of Iustice, and other

other Iudiciaries, which out of the perſons of many Iudges are made one body. In all which, thoſe that haue not beene there all the time, are not ſuffered to deliuer their opinions.

Secondly, it doth not hereupon follow, that the Biſhops haue approued of this councell, becauſe they gaue their conſents to the Articles of it: For, there is a great deale of difference betwixt thoſe that agree in opinion with the Decrees of a Councell, and thoſe that vphold an opinion, onely becauſe the Councell hath decreed it. For our Aduerſary agrees in opinion with the Deuill, in that it is written how God gaue his Angels charge ouer our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, yet he doth not I thinke, beleeue it neuer the more for that the deuill ſaid it.

Furthermore, at what time as they gaue their conſent to the Articles aforeſaid, the Councell was not confirmed by the Pope. Now it is our Aduerſaries owne Tenet, *That a Councell is void, if not confirmed by the Pope*; And this one reaſon hee makes to ſerue his owne turne againſt the Councell of *Baſil*. *It is* (ſaith he) *a Rule moſt generally knowne that Councels are not to be receiued without the authoritie of the Pope.* Whereupon it followes, That thoſe who gaue their conſents to the ſaid Articles, did at the very ſame time when they gaue their conſents, hold the ſaid Councell to bee as yet no Councell. So that a man cannot hereby proue, that they did receiue the Councell, becauſe they gaue their voyces to the Articles.

To the ſecond Obiection, which touches vpon the precedencie of the moſt Chriſtian King, he anſwers thus in briefe: *That the Councell was ſo far from offering to diminiſh the Kings Authoritie, that to the contrary, the Kings Ambaſſadors by the vnanimous conſent of all, were ſeated immediately next after the Emperour; but the Spaniſh Ambaſſador, out of his ranke, in another place: to the end, that if it ſo fell out, that any man were ſet out of his place, yet ſhould it not be preiudiciall vnto him.* Hee ſhould not haue anſwered, *That the Councell ſeated the Kings Ambaſſador next vnto the Emperour*, but onely that the Councell did not put him out of his right place. For in the 22. Seſſion, *Monſieur du Ferrier*, and *de Pibrac*, being ſuſpitious of the affection of the Councell, went in betimes to take vp their 2. *Obiect.*

places, insomuch that the Count de Lemos Ambassador for the King of Spain, made publike protestation before the Fathers, how that his place was taken vp: Whereupon Monsieur de Pisieux required, that the said protestation of his might not bee preiudiciall to his Kings Prerogatiue, whose Ambassadors had euer had the first place, next to the Emperours, as they had at the Councels of Constance and Lateran: But for all this, the Councell would not vnspire the businesse. And though they tooke not the place away from the Kings Ambassadors, yet our Aduersary confesseth, that they would not pronounce that this place did belong vnto them. For first he saith, *That the Spanish Ambassador was set out of his place.* Secondly, *That if any man were by chance set out of his rank, yet would not the Councell haue it to be preiudicial vnto him.* Which is nothing else then to declare, That that place, which they permitted the Kings Ambassadors to keepe for the time, for auoiding of contention (and for that they had betimes already taken it vp much against the wills of the Fathers) should not be preiudiciall vnto that right, which they thought to be due vnto the King of Spaine.

Secondly, put case the Councell haue beene so euenly affected (as he would make it) yet did they wrong (say I) neuertheleſſe, in forbearing to be vmpires openly in the Kings cause; For there is no man, that can deny a thing most apparant, at the first dash, but he must giue vpon it, by little and little: So that the first degree to it, is to call a thing into question: nor does any man wilfully call a thing into question, vnleſſe he purposes absolutely to deny it afterwards. So that it is easily discerned, that the Councell at this time bringing the Kings precedency into question, and making the King of Spaine equall with him, had a plot in it, at the next Councell to giue him the place aboue the King of France.

Lastly, admit the Councell to haue had no such plot vpon him, but only to carry an euen regard to both, yet the wrong remaines neuertheleſſe, it being no leſſe iniurious to make an inferior equall to his superior, then to make an equall superior to his equall.

There

There remaines now (saith our Aduersary) *the last Obiection only, viz. That the Councell of Trent hath decreed diuers things against the Realme of France; which is the reason that it is not receiued there. But this Obiection* (saith he) *serues little to the purpose. For the question is not onely about Ecclesiasticall Iurisdiction, but about Faith and Religion. Wherefore although but the Decrees of the Councell for Reformation bee not receiued in France, yet the Decrees which treat about Faith, are.*

Our Aduersary cannot deny, but that the Councell of *Trent* hath decreed some things against the French liberty: onely he answers, that all this hinders not the receiuing of the other Articles which meerely concerne Faith. His owne words are, *This obiection serues to little purpose, for that the question is not onely about Ecclesiasticall Iurisdiction, but about Faith, and Religion.* And I say againe, that this answer of his serues as little to the purpose; for that we treat not of things that concerne either Reformation, or Faith, but of the authority only by which those Decrees were enacted. That is to say, whether the Iudgement of the Councell of *Trent*, be in *France* receiued for a sentence not liable to be appealed from: and whether they here beleeue those Articles wherein they agree with the Councell implicitely, for that the Councell hath decreed them.

For how shall it bee proued, that a man who beleeues a thing which another hath reported, did beleeue it vpon the reporters credit, vnlesse he be conuicted vniustly, that he who reported this would not report an vntruth, and that hee durst trust him in any thing. But *France* now doth not beleeue the Councell of *Trent* in all things: for our Aduersary himselfe confesseth, that it refused the Decrees of the Councell which touched vpon *Reformation*. Whereupon it followes, that though *France* doth agree in opinion with the Councell in what it decreed concerning matters of Faith, yet doth it not hold this opinion for any regard to the councels authority, but for some other respect; else might he conclude as well, That the *Huguenots* do receiue the said Councell, for that they beleeue diuers Articles of it, which are against the *Anabaptists*, and other Heretikes of our time. For euen as they refuse the authority of

the said Councell, in that very same part whereof they receiue the Articles: so may we as well refuse the whole Councell, and yet receiue all the Articles; there being the same respect from the Articles of one part, to the authority of the same part, as from the Articles of the whole, to the authoritie of the whole. But let vs now thanke how hee concludes; that this Councell is receiued in France. *Our Aduersaries* (saith hee) *themselfe confesseth* (saith hee) *That this Councell is receiued by the Bishops. But who cannot perswade himselfe, that the Bishops haue another faith and religion from that professed by the King, and all the Catholike people? For, how may the King bee styled, The most Christian, if he were of a faith singular from the Bishops? And how should the people be called, The Lords flocke, vnlesse they acknowledge same Pastors.*

See then, this in briefe is his Argument: The Bishops haue receiued the Councell: The King and the people haue beleeued the Bishops: *Ergo, The Councell hath beene receiued by the King, the Bishops, the Clergie, and likewise of all the people of France.* I haue shewne already how he hath not made it good as yet, that the Bishops which then were haue receiued it: and for the Bishops and Clergie at this day, though diuers of them for the aduancement of the holy *League*, haue endeauoured to cause the said Councell to be receiued, yet might the King and the people refuse it notwithstanding, and yet not cease for all that, to bee of the same faith with them, in so much as the approbation of that Councell is not an Article of faith: for the Councell of *Ephesus* hath expressly prohibited vs the addition of any other Article of faith vnto those which were then receiued: in which number the receiuing of the *Tridentine* Councell is not. But supposing that they were not of the same Faith, what danger could come of it? *The King* (saith he) *should not then be most Christian, nor the people Christ his flocke.* First, as for the *King*, for as much as this reason is drawne from his Title, I say, that if the King were the greatest Heretike in the world, yet would hee not be depriued of his Title. *Henry* the eight, King of England, receiued the Title of *Defender of the faith* from Pope *Leo* the tenth, for

writing against *Luther*. King *Edward* the sixt, and the last Queene of famous memory, and the now raigning KING, who haue changed the Religion, for defending of which, King *Henry* receiued this Title, doe still keepe the same Stile: And by very good right too; for Titles, though personall, and proper only to the first of the Race that receiue them, (as *Catholike* to *Ferdinand* King of *Arragon*; *Defender of the faith*, to *Henry* the eight King of *England*) yet doe they descend vnto their successors, as ornaments onely annexed to their State. So that it is not *Philip* of *Austria*, who is Catholike in that sense, but the King of *Spaine*. For if we consider of Kings only in point of Religion, the King of *France* may be as good a Catholike as the King of *Spaine*; and the King of *Spaine* as good a Christian as the King of *France*; and yet the Title of *Christian* belongs onely vnto the one, and the Title of *Catholike* to the other.

But aboue all is this reason ill applied against the King of *France*, for that *Christian* is not a title to distinguish one Christian from another, but to distinguish them all from Pagans; and in this sense it is giuen to the King of *France*, as to the first King of *Europe* that abolished Paganisme, and who still had the most warres of all with the Sarazens, enemies of the name of Christ. True it is, that this title might incline him the more to embrace that doctrine which is best, but for that it hath not beene hitherto agreed vpon which of the two is the best, wee must not proue one doubt by another. For the *Huguenots* may as well conuert this reason to perswade the King to reforme the Church, as the Catholikes vse it, to incline him to maintaine the Romish Religion; howbeit there is not any thing that the King can doe more worthy of this Title of his, then to doe both; that is to say, to maintaine the Romane Church, and to reforme it. Neither is there any contradiction in these two, seeing there is no better meanes to make the Iron endure long, then to scower away the rust, not to maintaine the Church of Rome, then to reforme the abuses of it. Neuertheleſſe, to eſtabliſh ſuch a courſe, that any of the Iron bee not ſcraped away, inſtead of the rust; and yet

ſee

let that be bright scowred; there is no safer meanes then to doe quite contrary to that which our Aduersary aduiseth, *viz.* To let their Councell of *Trent* sleepe, & to call another wherein both parts may haue indifferent hearing: by which meanes, if so be that there be any corruption in the Church of Rome, it may be seene into and purged. And if there be any error in the doctrine of the *Huguenots*; they may be cuicted and instructed in a better faith. And this were the way to reunite vs all in one faith; and this would be an act indeede well worthy a most Christian King.

3. But descend wee now to the people; *How should they* (saith he) *be the sheepe of Christ's flocke, if so be they acknowledge not any Pastor?* Answer; That they may well enough acknowledge their Pastors, though they beleeue not iust as the Pastors of their Countrey doe. For that no man is obliged to build his faith, but vpon an infallible foundation; and it is confessed by the Catholikes themselues, that all the Bishops in a whole Countrey may erre in point of faith. So that the people are not alwayes obliged, to ground their faith vpon that of their Bishops, and consequently may bee of another faith, and yet be the flocke of *Iesus Christ*: As in very truth, our Sauiour does not call them his Sheepe which heard the Bishops, but those that heare *his* voyce; which is, the word of God.

Let vs now looke vpon his conclusion: *And so* (saith hee) *in the Councell honoured of the King, the Bishops, the Clergie, and likewise of all the people of France.* Admit it were so; yet for all this does it not follow, that it is receiued in *France*, vnlesse he can shew withall, that all the Estates doe receiue it: that is, The Church, the Nobility, and the People: But hee makes no mention of the Nobility, but onely of the Church, and the third Estate, so that at the most it is receiued but of two of the three Estates: which may be the cause that our Aduersary, to keepe vp the number diuides the Church into two parts, *viz.* Bishops, and Clergie: *The Councell* (saith hee) *is receiued of the Bishops, the Clergie, and likewise of all the people of France.* Which is a new diuision of the Estates, neuer, as I

perswade

perſwade my ſelfe, heard of before. Iudge then what iuſt occaſion the Nobility of *France* haue to reiect this Counſell, when as thoſe who would haue the Counſell receiued, doe reiect the Nobility.

CAP. 6.

That the Huguenots may very rightly be accounted members of the Catholike, Apoſtolike, and Romane Church.

THis Chapter, at the firſt bluſh, ſeemes to treat of the ſame Argument that the firſt doth: for hauing there proued it, That the *Huguenots* are of the ſame Religion with vs *Catholikes*, it may follow alſo, that they bee of the ſame Church too: And yet to my thinking, theſe two Chapters may very well be parted: not ſo much in regard of the difference of the nature of the ſubiect, as of the humors of the perſons. For commonly when a *Huguenot* would draw a *Catholike* to his opinion, he begins [illegible] and ſo vpon the purity of his doctrine he infers the verity of his Church.

A *Catholike*, on the other ſide, when he would winne a *Huguenot*, begins ſtill with the Church; and ſo by the verity of the Church concludes the purity of his Doctrine: and commonly, when either of them gets the other out of this tracte, they are to ſeeke. Which is one of the reaſons that they cannot ſatisfie the aduerſe party. For hee that would perſwade another, muſt not beginne with that principle which to him ſeemes beſt (though indeede it be ſo) but with that which ſeemes beſt in his opinion whom hee deſires to perſwade; otherwiſe he ſhall but loſe his labour.

For, when a *Huguenot* ſhall haue vrged a thouſand paſſages of holy Scripture to proue the truth of his owne particular aſſertion, hee ſhall not be a whit the neerer: and why? For that a *Catholike* will ſay inſtantly with himſelfe: What though I cannot anſwer him, yet another may: and if I am to

beleeue nothing which I am not able to maintaine by disputation, then should I not beleeue the *procceding of the Holy Ghost*: the *vnion of both Natures in Iesus Christ*: the *Mysteries of the holy Trinity*: all which I haue beleeued, without being able to maintain them, or so much as vnderstand them. And euen so, the authority of the same Church which makes me beleeue these Mysteries without being able to maintaine them, makes me also to beleeue the holy Sacrament of the Altar, Purgatory, &c. without being able to maintaine them. So that if a *Huguenot* proceed no further, and do not shew a reason how a man may be assured of these mysteries without the Churches authority; or else (which I hold more reasonable) why wee ought wholly to relye vpon the authority of the Church in one point, and not in another; hee shall neuer say ought to the purpose. Nor can the *Catholikes* haue any happier successe in their perswasiues: for when they talke to the *Huguenots* of the Church; how the Church sayes this, and the Church sayes that, and the Church cannot erre: they who are not brought vp to such kinde of phrases; and who found their faith vpon this perswasion, *That the Scripture is cleare on their side*, What care wee (will they say) what the Church saith, so long as wee agree in opinion with the word of GOD. So that a *Catholike* shall neuer be able to perswade them to any thing, if wee beginne not at their foundation; and proue, that the Scripture makes not so clearely for them as they imagine it does: and then when they once perceiue, that they cannot confute the *Catholikes* by Scripture; they will be compelled to confesse: That a man can haue no assurance of his faith, without submitting his owne iudgement to the iudgement of the Church: which (as wee say) according to Christs owne promise, is infallibly accompanied with the holy Spirit. For mine owne part, although it bee not my intention to intice any man, either to the one Religion or the other, but to qualifie only the passions of men; yet for feare that I should commit the same error in this *Treatise of Pacification*, which they often doe in the course of their perswasiues, I thought good to subioyne this Chapter also; to the end that my reasons might

might be drawne from the principles of both Religions. And this hauing proued in the first Chapter, by examination of the particular questions, according to the *Huguenots* method, that they bee no *Heretikes*, I was also desirous to adde this Chapter, that according to the *Catholikes* manner of proceeding (that is as much to say, as according to the Nature of the Church) I might also proue them (the *Huguenots*) to be no Heretikes. For it were but labour lost, to tell many of our *Catholikes*, that the *Huguenots* hold many of the fundamentall points of faith as well as we, seeing they take not the scandling of an Heretike by his opinion, but onely by his marke, *That he is out of the Church*, vnderstanding thereby no other Church, then that which wee call *Catholike*, *Apostolike*, and *Romane*, excluding all those out of the Church, to whom these three titles may not be giuen, what opinion soeuer they be of. For which reason I resolued to proue, that these three titles doe belong vnto the *Huguenots*.

And first touching the title of *Catholike*: the Church is called *Catholike* in three respects. 1. *In regard of it selfe.* 2. *In regard of the Iewes.* 3. *In regard of Heretikes.* I *Catholike.*

Now the Church is called *Catholike* in regard of it selfe, because in the vniuersalitie thereof it comprehends all times, and all places, *viz.* the whole number of the Elect, as well those who haue beene since the beginning of the world, and are now departed and triumphant in heauen, enioying euerlasting blisse, as those that are ordained to the like blessednesse whether now aliue, or to be borne hereafter. Which definition is founded vpon the Scriptures: for S. *Pauls* words are; *The Church of the first-borne which are written in heauen:* and who are written in heauen but the Elect? from whom the reprobates are in this specialty distinguished, *That their names are not written in the booke of the Lambe.* The Church then consists of the Elect, who are not restrained to any place or time. For, *Iesus Christ hath redeemed with his blood* (saith Saint *Iohn*) *Out of euery kinred, and tongue, and people, and nation:* With which definition the Fathers ioyntly consent; *All they* (saith Saint *Augustine*) *which are holy and sanctified,* I How the Church is called Catholike in respect of it selfe.

Heb. 12.23.

Reu. 13.8.

Reu. 5.9.

August. de Ciuitate Dei, lib. 20. cap. 12.

which are, haue beene, and shall be, ex Electis of the heauenly Ierusalem: And S. Gregory the Pope (that my proofe may be the more authenticall) saith, *That all the Elect are embraced in the bosome of the Church, and all the Reprobate are without.* And yet was poore *Iohn Husse* burnt for an Heretike, for affirming the very same.

Greg. Mor. in Iob. lib. 28. cap. 9.

O wicked *Catholikes*, that haue made a man to bee burnt for an Heretike, for affirming no more, then what a Saint had done, and (which is more) then a *Pope* had said before him. So then in this signification, neither the Church of *Rome*, nor that which themselues call the *Reformed* Church, can properly bee called the *Catholike* Church, but onely parts of it. Nay, we cannot truly affirme, but they be parts of the *Catholike* Church; but that God hath both in the *Romane* Church, and in the *Reformed*, some that be members of the *Catholike* Church. Which is as much to say, as that diuers shall be saued in both Churches. Like as there were many amongst the Iewes, at the comming of Iesus Christ; and at this day be in the Greeke Church, and in *Presbyter Iohns* Country, which doe embrace the Christian Faith, without acknowledging the Pope. So that if we vnderstand the title of *Catholike* in the *Romish* Church, onely taking it in this signification, it must needs follow, that either all the *Catholikes* are elected (though the *Catholike* Church saies that diuers Popes haue beene damned) or else, that no man was euer saued before Christs comming, and that God hath not had his Church at all times; or that no Greeke nor African can be saued in our time; and then God should not haue his Church in all places. Againe, if we attribute not this title of *Catholike* onely to the Church of *Rome*, I can see no reason why the *Reformed* Church should be more exhalted then the rest. To be briefe, when we passe our censure vpon any man, whether hee be of the *Catholike* Church, or not; we must speake either according to Faith, or according to Charity. If according to Faith, we cannot say, that such or such a man is a *Catholike*, *because it is God that knoweth who are his*, saith S. *Paul*: But if we passe our iudgement according to charity, this will haue vs esteeme all those

2 Tim. 2. 19.

to

to bee the true Catholike Church, which bee of the visible; of which I will next speake, and shew how it may be termed Catholike.

2 The Church, as I haue proued already, comprehends all the Elect, those as well that be already in heauen, as those that are yet on earth, and remaine mingled among the wicked; which last, though generally more in number, yet the Elect beare the name of the better part. So that both good and bad, which make an outward profession of the true faith, are reputed members of the true Church. According to the Parable of the net, which *held the bad fishes as well as the good.* This Church was separated from the rest of the Gentiles, with a partition wall (as it were) and before the comming of Christ pend vp in one country, and restrained to the Family of Israel: But since Christs comming, *This partition wall is* (as S. *Paul* saith) *broken downe; so that neither Iew nor Greeke are excluded.* And by reason of this difference, that the Iewes in those dayes had onely this priuiledge, and that now no one particular countrie hath it more then another, the Church is called *Catholike*: that is to say, Spread all the world ouer. And for that how is so vniuersall, she is deuided into particular Churches: As in Saint *Paul's* time, into the Church of Ephesus, of Rome, of Galatia, of Corinth, &c. and no one of these Churches hauing any priuiledge more then another, they were all together called *The Church Catholike*: not that it is alwayes euery where, but for that no country is excluded, and no place priuiledged. So then, no place being excluded, there may be other Churches besides that of Rome; and no place being priuiledged, euen Rome it selfe may be cut off from the Church.

2 How the Church is called Catholike, in respect of the Iewes.

Mat. 13.

Ephes. 2. 14.

3 Thirdly, the Church is called *Catholike*, in respect of the Donatists, who denied the Church to bee dispersed all ouer the world; but held it to be coopt vp in Affrica: whereupon it came to passe, that those Churches which held the contrary, were called the Catholike Churches. Euen as at this day, those Churches that hold, the Church to haue need of reformation, are called *The Reformed Churches*: Which is

3 How the Church is called Catholike, in regard of Heretikes.

the reason why the more ancient Fathers neuer vſed this terme *Catholike*, to diſtinguiſh the pure Churches from the hereticall; but called them *Orthodoxall*. But in proceſſe of time, by reaſon that the Orthodoxe Churches held, that the Church was Catholike or Vniuerſall; theſe two words *Catholike* and *Orthodoxall*, were taken in one and the ſame ſignification: ſo that at laſt, this title of Catholike, was not onely giuen to the Church, to diſtinguiſh the *Orthodoxe* from the *Donatiſts*, but alſo from all other Heretikes. For a Catholike in proper ſpeech is not oppoſite to all ſorts of Heretikes, but to the Iewes onely and the Donatiſts. But for ſo much as cuſtome is the maiſter of words (as we ſee in this word *Tyrant*, anciently taken in good part for a King, and now onely for a bad King) this word *Catholike* is taken contrary to his nature, in the ſignification of a pure Church; in ſuch a ſenſe as that a particular Church may be called a Catholike Church, and more or leſſe Catholike, proportionably as it is more or leſſe pure. So that the queſtion betweene the Catholikes and the Huguenots, lies not in this point, *viz.* Which of the Churches is the Church Catholike; but whether of them is moſt Catholike, and which moſt corrupted: for in ſome degree both of them may be Catholike, ſo long as they hold the ſubſtance of faith, (as I ſhewed in the firſt Chapter) and both of them in ſome ſort may be corrupt: it being a thing moſt certaine, That euery viſible Church may haue errors, more or leſſe. *The Church* (ſaith Saint *Bernard*) *as long as ſhe is in the tabernacle of this body hath not attained vnto the perfection of beauty, and is not therefore abſolutely faire*: For it is the priuiledge of the Church Triumphant onely to be faire, and as S. *Paul* ſaith, *without ſpot or wrinckle*. True it is indeed that the Church is ſometime called faire, but this is euer comparatiuely: wherefore the Bridegroome in the *Canticles* ſaith of his Spouſe (which is the Church) that ſhe is the faireſt of women: that is, *not ſimply faire* (ſaith S. *Bernard*) *but the faireſt among women*. And for that ſelfe ſame reaſon, is ſhe in one and the ſame verſe, ſtyled both blacke and faire. *I am blacke* (ſaith the Spouſe) *but I am comely*.

Bern. in Cant. Serm. 38.

Ephes. 5.

Cant. 1.

I am not ignorant how that the Ancients also did vse this word *Catholike*, for a distinction from an Heretike, in another signification; which in truth was according to the proper interpretation of the word, taking *Catholike* or *Vniuersall*, for a marke of the true Church. For which reason in the auncient Church, when as the whole visible Church yet retained the faith receiued from the Apostles, and that some part of it became corrupted; for the exact discerning vnto whether side we ought to leane, *Vincentius Lyrinensis* gaue this Rule: *What else should we doe* (saith he) *but prefer the safetie of the body, before a rotten member?* And therefore, for that the body of the Church was at that time sound, all the Church was called *Catholike*, for so much this word *Body*, as well as that word *Catholike*, implies an vniuersality; so that the distinction of *Catholike* and *Heretike*, serues but to distinguish the sound body, from a corrupted member. But so soone as the body it selfe became corrupted, then this rule and distinction failed. For which reason *Vincentius* makes a difference betweene a Catholike in *place*, and a Catholike in *time*. And euer when a Catholike in place is not a sure marke, hee hath recourse vnto a Catholike in time. *But* (saith hee) *if any new infection goe on not only to corrupt a part, but the whole Church, then must we cleaue to antiquity.* So that the difference betweene the Catholikes and the *Hugonots*, lying in this point, Whether the body of the Church be corrupted or no? wee must not speake of the Church which is Catholike according to place, but according to time. *And that Church is Catholike* (saith *Vincentius*) *which holds that Religion which hath beene euer hitherto embraced.* And to discerne which Religion hath beene alwayes embraced, when as the body of the Church, or the visible Church (as saith the same *Vincentius*) is corrupted; we must still haue recourse vnto Antiquity, and say with *Tertullian*, *Illud verum, quod primum: That is truest which is ancientest. So as that is the Catholike Church, which agrees in faith with the more Primitiue Church.* So that if wee would discusse it, whether the Catholikes or the *Hugonots* be most properly the right Catholikes; wee must consider

Vincent. Lyr. Aduers. hær.

Eadem lib. eadem hæres.

Tertul. lib. de præscript. aduersus hæres.

first

first, whether of them best holds of the faith of the Apostles; and next, of that of the ancient Doctors and Councels of the Church.

As for the title *Apostolike*, The Church may be called *Apostolike*, as well in regard of the *writings* as of the *Preachings* of the Apostles. As for their Writings, those Churches which embrace the doctrine deliuered in them, are intituled *Apostolike*; yea, and more or lesse *Apostolike*, as they doe more or lesse agree, or disagree, to or from the said doctrine. So that the word *Apostolike* is all one with the word *Orthodox*, or with *Catholike* taken in the last signification. And if the Church of the *Huguenots* may be entituled *Catholike* or *Orthodox*, they may also by the same reason be called *Apostolike*: nay and more properly *Apostolike* then *Catholike*. For the visible Church being (as I haue shewed) not absolutely, but comparatiuely, more or lesse *Catholike* or *Apostolike*, the *Huguenots*, though they may offend in default, and so be lesse *Catholike* rather; yet in this, they offend rather in the excesse, and are too *Apostolike*: as being so strict, that they will readily beleeue nothing, but what the Apostles haue written.

2 *Of Apostolike.*

Secondly, thole Churches were called *Apostolike*, which were instructed by the liuely voice of the Apostles, and where the Apostles haue had their seats, as Ierusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria, &c. where the Apostles *Peter*, *Iames*, *Iohn*, and *Marke* the Euangelist sate; and are therefore from all Antiquity stiled *Apostolicall Seats*, as well as Rome. Howbeit that this signification is rather an ornament, then a marke of a pure Church. For Antioch, Alexandria, and other Churches of Greece, where the Apostles preached, haue either altogether forsaken the name of Christ, or are at the least (according to the *Catholikes* Tenet) quite cut off for Schisme and Heresie, from the Communion of the true Church: and France, Spain, Poland, Germany, England, and Denmarke, where the Apostles neuer had any Bishopricks, haue sithence beene the true Churches. So that in this signification a Church may be pure; and yet not be *Apostolike*; and a Church which is *Apostolike* may be impure.

The

The last ride, though first in estimation with the Catholiques, is that of *Romane*; which I haue obserued to haue beene taken in three seuerall sorts. First, the *Romane* Church is only taken for the Diocesse of *Rome*, and was in the beginning, for the Citie of *Rome* alone. As in *S. Pauls* time, who inscribed an Epistle seuerally to *Rome* alone, as he did likewise to those Churches of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Galatia*, &c. For had the Church of *Rome* beene euery where at that time spread abroad, he had not needed to haue written to other Churches seuerally, because that in writing to that of *Rome*, he had then written to them all: And yet would our people needs make vse of this Epistle, to proue by it, The *Roman* church to be the catholique Church, because that in it, *S. Paul* saies, *Your faith is spread abroad in all the world*: as if *S. Paul* had not said the same to the Church of *Thessalonica*, *Your faith which you haue to God-ward is spread abroad*. But had the Church of *Rome* beene (as they would haue it) esteemed by *S. Paul* as all one with the Catholique; without all doubt his Epistle to the *Romans* had beene intituled Catholique, as well as those of *S. Iohn*, *S. Peter*, *S. Iames*, and *S. Iude*, which are therefore stiled Catholique, for that they were written to the Catholique Church. Now taking the *Roman* Church in this signification, I confes that not the *Huguenots* Churches alone are separated from the *Roman* Church, but all other catholique Churches besides: so that to this day they in *France* make a distinction of sundry customes of the *Romane* Church, and of the Church *Gallicane*.

3. How the Protestants may be said to be of the Romane Church.

Rom. 1. 8.

1 Thess. 1. 8.

Secondly, the Church of *Rome* is taken for the Westerne Church, insomuch that the *Roman*, *Latine*, and *Occidentall* Church, doth signifie one and the same thing, to distinguish it from the Greeke and Easterne Church; iust as the Empire of the East, and the Empire of the West, were called the Empires of *Rome* and of *Constantinople*, because that these two Cities were the chiefe seats of the Empire: and so by reason of the dignitie of the Citie of *Rome*, which was the seat of the Emperours that reigned in the West, all this Westerne part, was called the *Romane* Empire, and all the Westerne Church the *Roman* Church: that is to say, The Church contained vnder the *Roman* Empire. So then, if we call it the *Roman* Church, for distinguishing it from the *Greeke* and *Easterne* Churches; then also may the *Huguenot* Churches be members likewise of the *Roman* Church, for that they be *Westerne*, and not *Greeke*, nor *Easterne* Churches,

Churches. If any part of the *Roman* Empire, (taking the *Roman* Empire largely, as it was) they also be vnder the Empire, and by consequence vnder the Church. But taking the Empire as it now is, then may the Churches of *Germanie*, some of which haue shak'n off the Popes authority, be more properly stiled members of the *Roman* Church, than *Rome* it selfe; inasmuch as *Germanie* and not *Rome*, is at this day called the *Roman* Empire.

Lastly, the *Roman* Church is vnderstood, for all those, that doe in Faith communicate with the Church of *Rome*; that is to say, those that be of the *Romish* Religion. I demand then their meaning, whether they vnderstand by the *Romish* Religion, those points in which the *Huguenots* doe agree with vs, or those wherein they disagree from vs, or both the one and the other.

If those points wherein they agree with vs, then they are directly of the *Roman* faith. If for the points only wherein they dissent, then are the beleefe in the Trinity, and all the Articles of the three Creeds, of the Apostles, of *Nice*, and of *Athanasius*, wherein they doe agree, no Articles of the *Romish* Religion.

But if they take the *Roman* Religion, for all the points of it together, both for those wherein they doe agree, and all the other too; I demand once againe, whether so exact an agreement in all points, be required or not? And if not; then seeing that the points whereupon the *Huguenots* be agreed with the *Catholikes*, be for number more, and for importance greater, than those questions are, vpon which they disagree; they may yet neuerthelesse be reputed to be of the *Roman* Church and faith: forasmuch as things for the most part take their Denomination from the better part. Euen as we vse to say; those people are of a sanguine complection, in whom bloud is predominant, although their temper be of other humours too. But if we affirme, that no man can be of this Church, vnlesse he beleeues all, and the selfe-same, that the Church of *Rome* doth; then say I, that whilest we goe about to proue, that the *Huguenots* be not of our Church, we shall shew withall, that wee haue not any one man, who is absolutely of the Church: inasmuch as there is no one man learned or vnlearned, that beleeues all, that the Church doth.

For as the credit of our Doctors, to maintaine singular opinions [illegible]; which may be the reason why [illegible]

greater

greatest Aduersaries to the *Huguenots*, accuseth all the *Catholikes* that euer were before him, of Errour, and those especially, which haue written against the *Huguenots*; as *Gardiner*, *Bishop*, *Eckius*, *Hosius*, *Canus*, *Caietane*, *Sotus*, *Durand*, *S. Bonauenture*, *S. Thomas*, *S. Dominicus*: (for he spares not the Saints neither) the like courtesie also shewes he to the Ancient Fathers, *S. Augustine*, *S. Bernard*, *S. Chrysostome*, and much adoe he hath to let *S. Paul* alone. So that amongst so many dissentions, either hath the Church beleeued nothing at all, or else hath the Church beleeued them altogether, that is to say, contradictions; or else that the Church hath beleeued but only some of them: and perchance, they haue all beleeued contrary to what the Church beleeueth.

Come we now to the common people, and they vnderstand not the one halfe part of that which we teach them: and when we tell them of such points of Diuinity, wherein they were neuer brought vp; their fancies framing *Idols* vnto themselues, vpon what they heare, make them conceiue *Chimara's* in their braines, and to beleeue the quite contrary to what the Church doth, before they are well aware of it.

But our *Catholikes* now haue found out a remedy for that; which is, *That an implicite Faith is enough for the common people*, which is as much to say, as to thinke only, & to beleeue only as the Church doth, though they doe not so indeed. So then, seeing that an implicite Faith is, To beleeue the contrary, and yet thinke they beleeue the same; if wee could but once perswade the *Huguenots*, that they doe verily beleeue as our Church of *Rome* doth in euery thing, although indeed they doe not, they shall be of our Church. See then, if I haue not taken a better method to conuert them, then any other *Catholikes* haue yet light vpon. They labour to conuert them to our explicite faith, which were to make them beleeue all the particulars of our Faith. And I, perceiuing them altogether vncapable of this Explicite Faith, haue endeuored my selfe to make them embrace the Implicite Faith, which is much the easier of the two, and to perswade them to beleeue that they doe already beleeue, as our Church beleeueth: and consequently, that their Faith is the same, and their Church the same. That is by this perswasion they may become (if not so good Catholiques as the Papists yet at least, as good Catholikes as the people.

